

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 867

EC 160 888

AUTHOR Weaver, Betsy; Halloway, Sydney
TITLE Review and Planning Report for Student Support Services: P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313 Federally Funded Projects.
INSTITUTION Boston Public Schools, Mass.
PUB DATE Aug 82
NOTE 126p.; The document was developed through Student Support Services. Pages 73-333 (Section 4.3) of the original document, containing the project reports, have been removed due to poor quality.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Federal Programs; Parent Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts (Boston)

ABSTRACT

The report provides summary evaluative data on 18 federally funded special education projects in Boston involving more than 2,518 students, 632 parents, and 1,535 school staff. An introductory section provides background information on funding and levels of services provided to handicapped students in the Boston public schools. Section 2 focuses on the monitoring and documentation system designed to evolve into a general evaluation and tracking framework for all federal projects. Section 3 presents data on student participation (including distribution by language, race, and sex), staff participation, parent participation, and services provided to students (support services, teaching, individual counseling, screening, and occupational placement), staff, and parents. The impact and benefit of federal funding is examined via objectives established in participant service reports and a pilot verification process in which participants responded regarding satisfaction with services. (CL)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

ED236867

REVIEW AND PLANNING REPORT
FOR STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

P.L. 94-142

AND

P.L. 89-313

FEDERALLY FUNDED PROJECTS

BY

DR. BETSY WEAVER

WITH

SYDNEY HALLOWAY

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

AUGUST, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lenseth
Caldwell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC160888

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1.0 INTRODUCTION	
Purpose of Report	1
1.1 SPECIAL EDUCATION	4
2.0 DOCUMENTATION PROCESS	10
2.1 METHODOLOGY	10
General Caveats	
3.0 DISCUSSION	14
Students Served	
3.1 PARTICIPANTS IN EVALUATED PROJECTS	15
Students	16
Age Distribution of Students	
Prototype Distribution of Students	
Prototype Distribution of Students	
Sex/Race Distribution of Students	
3.2 STAFF	26
PARENTS	31
TYPES OF SERVICES PROVIDED	35
Services Provided to Students	
Services Provided to Staff	
Services Provided to Parents	
3.3 APPROPRIATENESS, IMPACT AND BENEFIT OF INVESTMENT	43
4.1 ORGANIZATION OF PROJECT REPORTS	67
4.2 DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS OF PROJECT REPORTS	68

	Page
4.3	REPORTS
	Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents 73
	Language Assistance K-High School 74
	Child Centered Therapy 82
	Parent Training in Severe Special Needs 94
	Career and Occupational Education for 502.4 Students 112
	Hearing Impaired Education/Work Study Coordinators 121
	Support Services for the Multi-Handicapped 166
	Private School Evaluation Teamleaders 176
	Urban Project 191
	Parent Information and Resource Project 239
	Four Special Assistants Student Support Services 267
	Planning, Policy and Evaluation Program 281
	Special Needs Alternative Education Program 295
	Early Childhood Program Development and Technical Assistance Program 303
	Career Instruction Managers 312
	McKinley School Prevocational/Satellite Program 318
	Over/Under Representation Project 323
	District Alternative Education 327
5.0	CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND PLANS FOR 1982-1983 334
6.0	APPENDICES
	A. Executive Memo
	B. 310, 320, 330 Forms
	C. Participant Service Codes
	D. Questionnaires

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The eighteen projects reviewed here represent 100% of the Federal special education funds for 1981-1982. This review indicates that, for the most part, funds are being spent on services for students and are being spent in a manner consistent with Federal legislative priorities. Some projects, however, do provide administrative support or services to parents. Data for students and parents have been computerized and are now reliable. Also, lists of students served are matched against the Master Student File. These computerization and check systems mark an important improvement since last year in the data collection procedure.

More than 2,518 students, 632 parents and 1,535 Boston Public School staff participated in the PL 94-142 and PL 89-313 projects. The range of services received by these participants varied widely across projects. In general, services were short-term in duration and intensity. They supplemented, rather than constituted, the special education program of the participant in question. Noticeable exceptions were in cases of 502.4 in substantially separate schools (McKinley and Tileston).

In general, student participants were at the extremes of age eligibility under each law. High school students and older represented the largest proportion of student participants, e.g., approximately 57%. Twenty-two percent of the students served were young children aged 5 or below. These proportions are consistent with estimates found last year. They are also consistent with a priority of PL 94-142 serving the "under-served or unserved" special needs student.

The division of participants among mainstream prototypes (502.1 - 502.3) and substantially separate prototypes (502.4 - 502.6) was approximately equal for those projects designed to serve students. However, in line with Federal priorities, there were more projects (11 out of 14) designed to supplement or enhance the educational programs of the more severely special needs students of Boston (substantially separate prototypes).

Ongoing projects continue to reflect the strong influence of state educational agency compliance concerns. Projects continue to be designed and implemented as a response to audit, compliance or legal issues. (Allen vs McDonough or prima facie denial, Chapter 71B, Section 6).

Student participants were most often male. This was true in six of ten cases. However, the distribution by sex among Hispanic special needs students was more equal. Compared to last year's estimates of distribution by sex, the proportion of males being served this year appears slightly lower. As for racial distribution, participation of black students was greater than that of white students. Fifty-eight percent of the students served were black, 29% were white, while 10% were Hispanic.

The Boston Public schools' PL 94-142 and PL 89-313 projects continued to be ongoing components of the general special education service delivery system; that is, they have been ongoing for more than two years. While funding levels have changed slightly, financial commitments have remained stable with regard to funding priorities, as for example in the early childhood area (two 502.4 projects) and in career information and support.

Changes have been made in the documentation and verification of these federally funded services. Likewise, a shift toward focusing on impacts as opposed to aggregate data has begun. This year, for example:

- Reliable new data for student and parent participation rates has been matched and verified with the student master file.
- A verification process involving interviews with the parents of students receiving services was piloted. Procedures and plans to expand this effort are in place for next year.

- Quality of education research projects provided more in-depth information on the impact of services provided. They also provided critiques of processes and procedures. While more work is necessary in examining the quality of these services as well as the impact of these investments, considerable steps have been made in that direction.

The Boston Public School Student Support staff supported by these federally funded projects has been trained in the use of computerized participant service reports. These reports provide reliable data which, when computerized, can be used to understand who is participating in these projects, what services they are receiving, and how much time is being spent receiving such services. Likewise, staff has been trained in reporting contextual information about the strengths and weaknesses of each project as well as problems and major accomplishments. Finally, for the first time, quality of education indicators have been developed in mini research projects by staff and evaluation staff. This training and technical assistance has increased the system's capacity to understand how resources are being used and to more adequately and appropriately plan for the future.

1.0 Introduction

Prior to 1980-1981, the Boston Public Schools Student Support Services Department contracted external evaluators (contract research firms) to evaluate all special education (SPED) P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313 projects. During this time, there had been a number of contractors (more than five in FY '79, in FY '80, seven) hired to fulfill the federal requirement for system review, tracking and monitoring. For several reasons, this model of subcontracting to external evaluators proved less than satisfactory.

First, because of frequent unanticipated funding delays, the evaluations often were not completed within a time span useful for internal planning and policy development. Additional delays were caused by the evaluators' lack of familiarity with the Boston Public School System. This necessitated their taking considerable time to learn about the Boston Public Schools, the Student Support Services Department, and the nature of the projects before being able to evaluate the projects themselves. This orientation process took a considerable amount of staff time and sometimes made it difficult for project evaluations to be as relevant as they might have been. Secondly, because of the vast variety of designs and methods used by different contractors, who often focused on only one of the 18 projects funded, it

was difficult to incorporate their recommendations into an overall, systematic review which could compare projects and measure their impact on the whole spectrum of special needs services.

Therefore, while the external evaluation model did fulfill the state and federal requirements for reviewing projects, it did not do so in a manner which was timely, well-coordinated or useful to the Boston Public Schools managers in terms of facilitating planning, management, and policy development processes. For this reason, a new monitoring documentation system was designed. It allows for a more useful, consistent, and cost-efficient approach to gathering information about these projects and tracking these investments. Although this system was initially limited to the externally funded projects, it has now begun to encompass other locally supported units. It will continue to do so until the entire special education service delivery system is monitored in a uniform manner.

This new system was first used in 1980-1981 (see Final Report 1980-1981). The primary objective for that year was to design and field test the system in order to acquire an initial baseline of information about the externally funded projects. With this initial baseline of information, a more thorough and specifically focused system of documentation could later be developed in accordance with perceived planning needs. Building on our

experience of last year, we are continuing to implement and refine this system.

The purpose of this report, then, is three-fold. First, it fulfills the federal requirement to document and monitor the federally funded special education programs of Boston. Second, it adds to last year's baseline data further information concerning the nature of project implementation and expenditure of funds. This information is designed to be useful for planning purposes within the Student Support Services Department. Finally, the report is designed to provide recommendations to the Student Support Services Department (e.g., the project manager and senior staff) with recommendations regarding potential management decisions which might affect not only particular projects but also future activities within the system as a whole.

To these ends, the report includes five major sections. The first section provides background information and general caveats for interpreting the presented data. The second describes the documentation process and methodology. The third provides a general discussion across projects, focusing on project participants and the types of special education services provided to them under federal grants. This across-project discussion concludes with a subsection on project impacts. Following this overview of the projects, section four

presents specific project reports comprised of data gathered from objective sheets (contextual narratives), participant service reports (computerized incidence data), and quality of education research (examination of project quality and impact). Section five generates conclusions and recommendations from the data referred to in sections three and four. It also outlines the general plan anticipated for the monitoring and review system for 1982-1983.

1.1 Special Education Legislation and Funding

Legislation has been passed to provide free and appropriate equal educational opportunity to handicapped children who, in Massachusetts, are referred to as special needs students. The Education of all Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) and the Title VI State Operated Schools Act (P.L. 89-313) established appropriations to assist states in implementing and providing education for special needs children. Under P.L. 94-142 these appropriations take two forms: 1) entitlement funds and 2) discretionary or incentive grant funds. The entitlement funds are granted to states in Section 611 (a) of the law which indicates:

The Commissioner shall, in accordance with the provision of this part, make payment to states for the purpose of assisting the states in initiation, expansion and improvement of programs and projects for the education of handicapped children at the preschool, elementary school, and secondary level

in order to provide full educational opportunity to all handicapped children. Such payment may be used for early identification and assessment of handicapping conditions in children under the ages of three.¹

These entitlement funds authorize each state to receive money based on the number of students identified by each local educational agency (LEA) as having handicapping conditions.

In fiscal year 1981-1982 the Boston Public Schools received \$ 391,125.00 in entitlement funds under P.L. 89-313 and \$ 2,053,280.00 under P.L. 94-142, a total of approximately 2.4 million dollars. This represents a slight increase over the 1980-1981 Federal contribution of approximately 2.3 million dollars. The locally budgeted funds for special education totalled \$ 46,352,854. This amount includes the total from State Chapter 70 (\$ 21,060,440.). The proportion of each of these funds to the total special education funding amount and the source of funding for 1980 through 1982 are shown in Table 1 (page 6).

During 1981-1982, Boston's investment in Special Education services totalled approximately \$ 46,352,854. Of this total, only \$ 2,444,405 came from federal funding. The federal contribution to Student Support Services in Boston was thus approximately 5% of the total Special Education budget. Therefore, the projects supported by these funds represent a small portion of the total monies spent in special education as well as a

TABLE 1:

DISTRIBUTION BY AMOUNT AND PERCENTAGE FOR TOTAL YEAR: FEDERAL, AND
LOCAL FUNDS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION IN BOSTON FROM 1980-1983**

	LAST SCHOOL YEAR 1980-1981	CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR 1981-1982	(PROJECTED) NEXT SCHOOL YEAR 1982-1983
Local Budget for Special Education**	\$ 46,145, 272	\$ 46,352,854	\$ 47,000,000
FEDERALLY FUNDED PROJECTS			
P.L. 89-313 Entitlement	\$ 361,250	\$ 391,125	\$ 463,500
P.L. 94-142 Entitlement	\$ 21,922,800	\$ 2,053,280	\$ 2,074,395
TOTAL	\$ 2,284,050	\$ 2,444,405	\$ 2,437,895
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 48,429,322	\$ 48,797,259	\$ 49,537,895

* Taken from Data Summary Boston Public Schools LEA plan 1982-1983.

** State Aid re-imbursement under Chapter 766 contributes to this amount. This State Aid made it possible for the City to levy less city taxes by this amount. The amounts of State Aid are respectively: 1980- \$ 22,407,634 1981- \$ 21,060,440 1982- \$ 21,000,000

small portion of the services provided to special needs students in Boston Public Schools. Nonetheless, as federally mandated, all LEA's must document and monitor these expenditures and evaluate their impact.

While federal contributions to the Student Support Services Department are increasing slightly in available dollars, circumstances have changed which affect the federally funded projects. Up until this year, indirect costs (which were taken out before projects were designed and staffed) were approximately 2%. As of 1982-1983, this figure will increase to 8%. The effect is that a smaller proportion of the federal dollars will go directly toward services.

Currently, the Boston Student Support Services Department (SPED) provides over 12,326 students with some form of special education service. Unfortunately not all SPED students are eligible for funds because of percentage ceilings imposed by the aforementioned laws. For each eligible student, however, the amount of special education received varies tremendously according to individual needs. Some students receive only an hour of speech therapy a week, while others are in full-time residential therapeutic programs. The majority of students in SPED receive less than 60% of their education out of the regular classroom.

It is important to understand that although a specific number of students are designated as eligible under

these federally funded programs, the legislation specifies that these funds should be used to respond to problems throughout the entire community and should not necessarily be divided up and spent equally on each eligible student. The legislation mandates that priority should be given to the provision of services for students who are not served, who are underserved, or who are the least served and/or the most severely handicapped in each disability category. Therefore, Boston's Student Support Services, like all LEAs, has decided what specific areas of its service delivery system need to be supported and enhanced in order to fulfill the mandates of the law. Likewise, one can expect that as new needs evolve, the federal monies will be used to accommodate these needs. Programs previously initiated by these funds will then be picked up by the community and funded locally.

Boston Public Schools has decided to spend its approximately 2.4 million dollars in federal funds on special needs students in eighteen (18) projects. Table 2 (Page 9) lists all of Boston's externally funded SPED projects and the level of funding for each project. It will be noted (see footnote to table) that not all projects were reviewed in the same way by this document. Those reviewed in a different way (Urban Project, Four Special Assistants Services, and Planning, Policy and Evaluation) are noted and represent less than 11% of the P.L. 94-142 funds available for the city. The review of these projects does, however, fulfill the federal requirements.

TABLE 2:

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR EACH OF BOSTON'S
FEDERALLY FUNDED SPECIAL EDUCATION PROJECTS IN 1982

Project Title	Amount of Funding
P.L. 94-142	
Urban Project**	\$ 6,000
Parent Information/Assistance and Resource Project	76,334
Four Special Assistants Student Support Services**	130,319
Planning, Policy, and Evaluation Program**	90,495
Special Needs Alternative Education Program	85,271
Early Childhood Program	256,643
Career Instruction Managers	323,016
Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School	404,718
Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan	139,897
District Alternative Education Center	540,587
Sub Total	\$ 2,053,280
P.L. 89-313	
Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents *	\$ 8,401*
Language Assistance Project	44,501*
Child Centered Therapy Model	9,580
Parent Training in Severe Special Needs	56,433
Career Occupational Ed. for 502.4 Students	81,237
Hearing-Impaired Evaluation and Service	44,207
Support Services for Multi-Handicapped Students	44,149
Private ETLs	165,099
Sub Total	\$ 391,125
Grand Total	2,444,405

* These projects are not indicated in the total P.L. 89-313 because they are not part of the LEA entitlement fund.

** Generally not direct-service project (review design narratives).

2.0 Documentation Process

The goal of the Student Support Service Department was to develop a monitoring and documentation system which would facilitate planning processes based on the evaluation of all students and student support services. In some respects, therefore, this year's review and monitoring effort represents the second year in a process which will gradually evolve into a general evaluation and tracking system for Student Support Services' programs.

The dual purpose of the 1981 monitoring effort represent the second year in a process which will gradually evolve into a general evaluation and tracking system for federally funded projects in Boston was as follows:

1. To fulfill state and federal requirements for establishing a monitoring system for special education P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313 projects.
2. To fulfill the Boston Public Schools' need for timely, reliable documentation data for short and long-term planning.

2.1. Methodology

In general, the approach to evaluation was to rely on data collected by project directors during the course of the year (FY '81-82). As noted earlier in this report, the documentation data comes from three sources: Objective Sheets, Participant Service Reports, and

Quality of Education research activities. Each of these sources is described in more detail below. These elements evolved from the 1980-1981 interviewing and documentation process. They have been considerably refined this year. Sample forms and interview schedules can be found in the appendix. Data was collected this year in December, in March, and to a lesser extent, in June. Participant Service Reports represent services provided from September through March.

1. Project Objective Sheets - These narrative logs, maintained by project directors, provide an overview of program activities and trends, accomplishments, and problems. In effect, they enhance statistical data while providing a context for it.
2. Participant Service Reports - These one-page reports on each major service are completed by service providers. They render data on each participating student, staff member, or parent, outlining services that were provided, duration of services, and the objectives accomplished.
3. Quality of Education Questions - These "mini research" projects provide qualitative information by responding to key educational issues raised by program staff. Issues researched this year included, for example: student retrieval from private schools, early childhood enrichment programs designed to keep learners-at-risk in the regular education program, parent com-

plaint systems, and the effectiveness of each of the above. Surveys, case studies, and interviews have been the research techniques utilized. The central evaluation staff assists each project director in designing and executing these research activities. The central evaluation staff also oversees the other model components while providing technical assistance (along with data verification and control) to other project staff members.

In terms of methodology, a number of caveats must be considered while interpreting the findings of this report. First, and perhaps most important, this has been the first year that project directors and staff have used these forms and processes. Last year, although similar processes were used, most of the data came from evaluation staff interviews of project directors (see 1980-1981 final report pp.). Therefore, despite training and reviews, there was some confusion this year as to how to complete forms. For this reason, rather than collecting incidence information for September through June, this type of information was collected September through March; the remainder of the year was used to correct and clarify data submitted. Based on this experience, these procedures have been improved and standardized for 1982-1983.

Secondly, one must consider the accuracy of the numbers. All participants who received services had to

be identified by name and Boston Public School identification number. No participant was counted unless the identification number matched the I.D. of an active, and/or currently enrolled, BPS student. Non-matching numbers were deleted. Also, if an incorrect number was rendered by a service provider, if a number was incorrectly keypunched, or if there was incorrect data about a given student in the master file, slight discrepancies might exist regarding descriptions of student characteristics within or across projects. For example, in the Early Childhood Project a number of students were listed (12) but with incorrect I.D. numbers. Although these numbers were valid, they were for students 9-18 years old. Given their age, these BPS students clearly had not participated in the Early Childhood Project. Therefore, even though table totals accurately reflect the number of enrolled BPS students, slight discrepancies still exist because of deletions and errors. As these discrepancies are found and corrected, the tables and project reports will be updated. Nonetheless, the data for this year is far more precise and accurate than the gross estimates of last year.

Thirdly, one should consider that codes used this year were generated from last year's interviews. Service providers using these codes often used the same code to describe a very different service. This problem

should be eliminated next year. Project staff will have developed codes that are accompanied by definitions.

Finally, further verification is needed to assure participant reaction to the services. This will help improve our understanding of the impacts of these investments. Verification efforts were begun this year (see section 3.3). While all numbers concerning participatns are reliable, continued verification efforts will not only guarantee the accuracy of this count but will also guarantee the quality of service provided.

3.0 Discussion

The Boston Public Schools spent its P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313 dollars on eighteen projects. Of these eighteen projects, fourteen generally provided direct services to students. Four generally provided indirect services. These four essentially were administrative support and/or staff or parent development projects. They are identified by "***" on Table 2 (p.9). The first Tables described on the following pages focus on those projects which provided direct services to students. Section 3.2 focuses on the staff and parent participation projects. However, the Parent Information/ Assistance and Resource Project is discussed in both the student direct service section and the parent sec-

tion. This project provided services to parents, but also addressed specific problems and concerns that pertained to particular students' needs. For example, it addressed the appropriateness of the program, problems with getting services, the appropriateness of the IEP, etc. All projects reviewed, listed by title and level of funding, are presented in Table 2 (page 9).

3.1 Participants in Evaluated Projects

Participation in one of the federally funded projects was defined as the receipt of direct or indirect service from a project by a student, BPS staff person or parent of the Boston Public Schools. Direct services are those provided to students as the primary purpose of schools; is to serve students. Consequently, services provided are indirect only in that they are not provided to primary clients of the system. It is important to appreciate that while participation means that the student was provided with some form of services, the term participation does not purport to define or evaluate the quality of the services being provided. Likewise, it is important to understand that there was a wide range of types of participation. Some students in the Career Instruction Managers project, for example, only received an initial screening intake interview to discuss

their career plans whereas in another project, the McKinley (502.4) School, students were enrolled full-time and were receiving not only their academic program but also support services. In essence, then, the term "participation" provided us with a count of students (and later of parents and staff) who have received services from these projects.

STUDENTS

Overall, there were 2,518* students who participated in the federally funded projects in 1981-1982. Before discussing how these student participants distributed by race, sex, language and prototype, an explanation of how we arrived at the total will assist the reader in interpreting the data in the tables.

First, we only used student identification numbers (I.D.'s) which reflected active BPS students. Therefore, whereas last year we used unsubstantiated totals which were estimates (provided through interviews of Project Staff and Directors), the number of students served this year can be substantiated. This fact makes the total far more reliable. The totals on all tables (project and

* 123 students participated in more than one project. The absolute total, then, without these duplications would be 2,395. But because these students were legitimate participants in multiple projects and therefore eligible for count in more than one project, they were not deleted. Their inclusion reflects accurate project counts and distributions.

grand totals) agree for student participants. It must be understood that this is a conservative figure, given that all numbers which were suspect or could not be matched with the student master file were deleted, thereby decreasing the totals. As time permits, these "suspect ID's" will be thoroughly reviewed with the potential of revising or increasing the total number of students served.

Another aspect of this total needs to be understood. This total of 2,518 students was derived from the portion of the year that was studied. In September, all Project Staff were trained in the use of the computerized participation service forms (see Appendix, Forms 310, 320, 330). These forms required that they keep ongoing, detailed records of services provided to specific students. This data was collected in December and then again in March. It was anticipated that all of this information would be keypunched and that in March, computer analysis capabilities would be used to assist the staff in understanding this information. Unfortunately, access to the computer was delayed due to problems in other programs (notably in SEIM and IEP program design, development, and implementation). Therefore, by March, no information on the federally funded projects had been keypunched. The data represented on the student participant tables was first keypunched in

March; it presents reliable information on all projects for 70% of the year. The study period for this year, then, was September through March. Reviewing this portion of the year has given us an accurate sense of trends and participation figures. It has also allowed us to refine the instruments and produce a final report within enough time to be of use to the State Educational Agency, project staff, and Student Support Service managers. To estimate how many students might have been served from March through June, one need only add 30% of 2,518 to the total. Thus, an estimated grand total for the 1981-1982 school year might be closer to 3,274. But because we can substantiate the 2,518, we have used this figure throughout the report.

For the time period studied, then, 2,518 students participated in 18 projects. This represents 20% of all students receiving student support services in the Boston Public Schools. Keep in mind that the funds for these services are not assistance funds (i.e., funds which must be equally distributed and allocated across eligible students). Rather, they are incentive funds for initiating new programs and for expanding programs for the least served and the most severely disabled students. This proportion of students served, therefore, represents a significant proportion of the students eligible under these laws.

In these projects, student special education services under P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313 are provided to students ranging in age from 3 to 22 years. This year, the greatest proportion of students served by the projects fell in the age range of 15-19 year olds. The second highest proportion of students served by these projects were the youngest students, or early childhood students, children between the ages of 2 and 6 years. Age by age totals across projects and for each project can be found on Table 3 (page 20). More specifically, the 393 five-year olds, 376 sixteen year olds, and the 362 fifteen years olds represent the largest number of students by age served. Considering that the two largest projects (in terms of numbers of staff serving students) are the Early Childhood Project and the Career Instruction Manager's project, this data is not surprising. Also, this information is similar to last year's estimates. However, this year's data allows for a more precise assessment. For example, there was no information available last year on whether or not students who were past the age of graduation were receiving any benefits from these funds. This year some 90 students (or 4%) between the ages of 20 and 22 years old are being provided services through these federally funded projects. Once again, this is consistent with the requirement of P.L. 94-142 that the school system's efforts be concentrated on those under-

TABLE 3:
DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT PARTICIPANTS BY FEDERALLY FUNDING
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROJECT BY AGE NUMBER - 1982*

PROJECTS LISTED	AGES																						TOTAL
P.L. 94-142	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
Urban Project (4422)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parent Information/Assistance and Resource project (4424)	0	2	3	6	11	4	8	6	7	6	1	3	5	6	5	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	79
Four Special Assistance Student Support Services (4425)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Planning, Policy and Evaluation Programs (4425)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Special Needs Alternative Education Program (4427)	0	1	1	2	3		4	1	5	2	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Early Childhood Program (4428)	2	10	10	79	49		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	592
Career Instruction Managers (4429)	0		21		1	1	3	0	0	0	7	97	293	317	240	162	67	18	8	2			1216
Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School (4430)	0						1	0	2	6	19	12	15	25	17	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	116
Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan (4431)	0			4	3	9	10	18	18	18	15	10	16	14	7	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	160
District Alternative Education Center (4432)	0																						
P.L. 89-313																							
Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents (3348)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Language Assistance Project (3349)	1				1	2	3	2	3	1	4	3	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	27
Child Centered Therapy Model (3350)	0				0					0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	1	3	2	0	14
Parent Training In-Severe Special Needs (3379)	0				0			3		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Career Occupational Ed for 592.4 Students (3380)	0				0										2		7	16	21	22	19	2	91
Hearing-Impaired Evaluation and service (3381)	0						1		1				3	1	3	0	1	2	2	10	3	0	27
Support Services for Multi-Handicapped Students (3382)	0			1	1	3	3	2	1	1	0	2	1	0	2	1	4	1	1	4	1	0	29
Private ETL's (3383)					0	1	5	1	3	2	4	5	9	8	4	7	10	12	4	1	1	0	77
TOTAL:	3	12	14	105	79	25	29	40	37	50	42	62	57	36	87	299	205	108	60	33	4		2518

*1. Data September 1981 through March 1982

2. Age as of October 1, 1982
(above 6 month rounded to older year)

3. All duplicates deleted

4. Correction made to 4428. Twelve students to age 5 previously misplaced in ages 9 to 19.

served or least served students.

Table 4 (Page 22) represents the distribution of students by prototype across projects. Looking at overall totals for the mainstream prototypes 502.1-502.3, (e.g., 1,036) versus overall totals for the substantially separate prototypes 502.4-502.6 (e.g., 1,027), we see that there are approximately equal numbers of students served in each category. The mainstream total, however, is comprised primarily of students from the Career Instruction Manager's Project and other P.L. 94-142 projects. The substantially separate total is comprised almost completely of students from the 502.4 i projects, all of the P.L. 89-313 projects, and a small proportion of the CIM projects. Therefore, as was the case last year, while the overall totals between these two types of programs are similar, there are a greater number of projects which are designed to serve and assist students who have more severe special needs.

Also of note are two other totals within this year's Table 4. First, those students served in the substantially separate prototypes are predominantly in 502.4 prototypes. This means that these students are served within the Boston Public Schools as opposed to within private, day or residential programs. Secondly, there are 50 students who are served under a prototype categorized as "E". This prototype signifies a 502.4 i project. These are the most restricted Boston-based Substantially Separate

TABLE 4 : DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT PARTICIPANTS BY FEDERALLY FUNDED SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROJECT BY PROTOTYPE 1982*

PROJECT LIST	SPECIAL EDUCATION PROTOTYPES											
	Mainstream			substantially separate						Blank	Total	
P.L. 94-142	502.1	502.2	502.3	502.4	502.4(1)	502.5	502.6	502.7	502.9			
Urban Project (4422)	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	----	----	----	----	----	
Parent Information/Assistance and Resource Project (4424)	1	5	4	51		0	0	0	0	16	79	
Four Special Assistance Student Support Services (4425)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Planning, Policy and Evaluation Programs (4426)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Special Needs Alternative Education Program (4427)	0	1	0	32	1	1	0	0	0	0	35	
Early Childhood Program (4428)	14	32	4	99						443*	592	
Career Instruction Managers (4429)	115	477	282	292		1			1	48	1,216	
Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School (4430)	0	0	0	114	0	1	0	0	0	1	116	
Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan (4431)	6	48	34	60	6	1				5	160	
District Alternative Education Center (4432)	0	0	1	2	39	5				3	49	
P.L. 89-313												
Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents (3348)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
Language Assistance Project (3349)				27							27	
Child Centered Therapy Model (3350)				14							14	
Parent Training In-Severe Special Needs (3379)				5							5	
Career Occupational Ed for 502.4 Students (3380)	1	1		89							91	
Hearing-Impaired Evaluation and Service (3381)				27							27	
Support Services for Multi-Handicapped Students (3382)				29							29	
Private ETL's (3383)	1	3	4	57	4	3				5	77	
	140	567	329	898	50	12	0	0	1	521	2,518	
	1036			1027								

*1. Data September 1981 through March 1982.

*1. Data September 1981 through March 1982.

2. All duplicates deleted

3. 213 of 443 Enrichment Regular Education Students. Other 230 may be awaiting assignment or may have DI SPED Code missing.

schools.

Finally, 392 students from the Early Childhood Program (ECE) are not listed under any prototype, and the designation for them is "blank". At this point there appear to be essentially two explanations for this designation. First, a number of these students are students who have been recently screened and have not entered Boston Public School Special Education Programs yet but will do so in the fall. Secondly, a total of 213 students who do not have special education prototypes are students this project is serving as regular education students. This is part of the ECE's priority to serve "at-risk learners" within the regular education mainstream to help maintain them in regular education. This enrichment program (see quality of education question for Early Childhood Project) will be studied over the next several years to determine the impact and effect of this intervention strategy. Generally, though, this year it has assisted in keeping 274 students from being automatically referred to special needs programs and has assisted in maintaining 213 of those students in regular education throughout the year.

The distribution of sex and race of students participating in these federally funded projects continues to be considered for two reasons. First, the Boston Public School system is under continued court order to

desegregate its schools. Second, Boston was cited four years ago for prima facie denial of equal educational opportunity for minority students in its special education programs (Chapter 7B, sec. 6). Therefore, it is particularly important to examine distributions of these characteristics in order to insure that students from minority groups are participating in proportions which are comparable to those of majority culture students. Table 5 (page 25) represents the distribution by sex and race of students participating in this year's 18 federally funded projects. In 1981-1982, of the 1,468 students receiving services under these federally funded projects, 58% of the students were Black students; 734 students, 29%, were White students; and 243 students or 10% were Hispanic students. These figures are generally similar to those provided by last year's estimates and are also consistent with proportions of students served system-wide. Also similar to 1980-1981 estimates, substantially more boys are served under these federally funded projects than girls. Sixty-five percent (65%), or 1,648 students served by these projects are male. The other 871 students served by these projects are female. Last year, estimates suggested that the ratio of males to females was 7 to 10. This year, figures suggest the ratio is 6 to 10.

TABLE 5 : DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT PARTICIPANTS BY FEDERALLY FUNDED SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROJECTS BY RACE AND SEX - 1982

PROJECT LIST	BLACK		WHITE		HISPANIC		ASIAN		AMERICAN INDIAN		OTHER		BLANKS		TOTAL
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
P.L. 94-142															
Urban Project (4422)	--	--	--	--	--	--									--
Parent Information/Assistance and resource project (4424)	21	14	27	13	3	1									70
Four Special Assistance Student Support Services (4425)	--	--	--	--	--	--									--
Planning, Policy and Evaluation Programs (4426)	--	--	--	--	--	--									--
Special Needs Alternative Education Program (4427)	18	1	13	1	1	0					1		0	0	35
Early Childhood Program (4428)	184	129	91	75	49	42	8	10			1	3	0	0	592
Career Instruction Managers (4429)	528	244	228	106	50	27	2	3	4		13	3	6	2	1216
Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School (4430)	40	15	39	12	8	1	2	1							116
Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan (4431)	80	36	11	4	19	6	2	1					1		160
District Alternative Education Center (4432)	36	2	7	10	4	0	0	0					1		50
P.L. 89-313															
Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents (3348)	--	--	--	--	--	--									--
Language Assistance Project (3349)	4	0	5	2	5	11									27
Child Centered Therapy Model (3350)	3	2	2	3	1	3									14
Parent Training In-Severe Special Needs (3379)	1	2	0	1	0	0			0	1					5
Career Occupational Ed for 592.4 Students (3380)	19	19	33	44	0	4			0	0					91
Hearing Impaired Evaluation and Service (3381)	7	4	5	9	0	4			0	0					27
Support Services for Multi-Handicapped Students (3382)	9	7	6	6	0	0					0	0		1	29
Private ETU's (3383)	25	18	16	7	2	2	1	0			4	1	1	0	71
TOTAL:															
(by race and sex)	975	493	483	251	142	97	15	15	4	1	19	7	9	3	2,518
total by race	1,468		734		243										
	58%		29%		10%										

In 1980-1981 there was no data available about the language of students served by these federally funded projects. This year, Table 6 (page 25) gives some information about the language spoken by the students served. The fact most noticeable about this table is not that 1,321 of the students speak English and 98 of the students speak Spanish, but rather it is that records for 1,055 of the students served by these projects include no information about language spoken. This number represents 50% of the cases. It is most logical, assuming that bilingual concerns are not an issue, that perhaps this information is not included on the students' Master File. It may be, then, that this 50% of the students speak English. Nonetheless, the lack of this information about language represents a potential weakness of the Department of Implementation's file. It must be taken into consideration whenever statistics are taken from this source.

STAFF

As suggested earlier, the projects supported by entitlement funds involve five types of intended recipients: Students, parents, regular and special educators, non-Boston Public School education staff, and project staff. The majority of projects were designed to provide direct services, in one form or another, to students. General information about these projects and

**TABLE 6: DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION BY FEDERALLY FUNDED SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROJECTS BY LANGUAGE 1982**

PROJECTS LISTED											
P.L. 94-142	ENGLISH	CAPE VERDIAN	CHINESE	FRENCH	GREEK	ITALIAN	PORTUGUESE	SPANISH	OTHER	BLANKS	TOTAL
Urban Project (4422)											
Parent Information/Assistance and resource project (4424)	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	42	79
Four Special Assistance Student Support Services (4425)											
Planning, Policy and Evaluation Programs (4426)											
Special Needs Alternative Education Program (4427)	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	35
Early Childhood Program (4428)	451	1	2	0	1	4	2	42	7	82	592
Career Instruction Managers (4429)	616	0	3	5	3	9	2	31	0	547	1216
Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School (4430)	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	82	116
Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan (4431)	68	0	3	0	0	0	0	10	0	79	160
District Alternative Education Center (4432)											
P.L. 89-313	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	50
Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents (3348)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Language Assistance Project (3349)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	14	27
Child Centered Therapy Model (3350)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	14
Parent Training In-Severe Special Needs (3379)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Career Occupational Ed for 592.4 Students (3380)	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	48	91
Hearing Impaired Evaluation and Service (3381)	12	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	27
Support Services for Multi-Handicapped Students (3382)	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29
Private ETL's (3383)	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	64	77
TOTALS:	1321	1	8	7	4	13	4	98	7	1055*	2518

* Data not collected for older students "probably english" (DI 7/21/82)

Table 7: Staff Participants Served by Federally Funded Projects September through March 1981-1982

C 40 A Project Numbers	PROJECT STAFF	BPS STAFF		NON-BPS STAFF	TOTAL
		SPED	REGULAR		
P.L. 89-513					
(3348) = Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents (No Data, Summer only)					
(3349) = Language Assistance Program	8	84	2	1	95
(3350) = Child Center Therapy Model	5	19	2	5	31
(3379) = Parent Training In-Service Special Need	2*	15*			17
(3380) = Career Occ. Ed. for 502.4 Students		75		1	76
(3381) = Hearing Impaired Evaluation & Service	5	75	2	9	91
(3382) = Support Serv. for Multi-Handicapped Students-Not Operational -Only Adm. work to date		41			41
(3383) = Private ETL's					
TOTAL	20	309	6	16	351
P.L. 94-142					
(4422) = Urban Project		20			20
(4424) = Parent Information/Assistance and Resource Project		20			20
(4425) = Four Special Assistance Student Support Services	4*				4
(4426) = Planning, Policy, and Evaluation Prgm.			220**		220
(4427) = Special Needs Alternative Education Prgm.	4	17			21
(4428) = Early Childhood Program	1	232	155	130	518
(4429) = Career Instruction Managers	11	112	84		207
(4430) = Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School					
(4431) = Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan	2	136	16	20	174
(4432) = District Alternative Education Center					
TOTAL	22	517	220	150	1184
GRAND TOTAL	42	826	220	166	1535

* Estimates

** Total of those completing course could not be broken down into regular or special education staff.

the types of students they serve has already been presented. A section discussing parent recipients is forthcoming. The section below presents information about the staff served; staff being regular and special educators, non-Boston Public School education staff, and project staff.

Approximatley 1,535 persons were staff participants. Of the eighteen existing projects, sixteen reported having served this type of recipient. It is interesting to note that thirteen of these sixteen projects had not targeted staff as their primary recipient group, although in the end, they did provide them with services. In 1981-1982, only three projects were actually designed to serve staff; The After School Inservice Training Project (ASIST), The Over/Under Representation Project, and the Urban Project. 220 staff, generally being regular and special education staff within the Boston Public Schools, completed inservice training under the auspices of the ASIST project. This project is currently part of the Planning, Policy and Evaluation Project. In actuality, more than 220 Boston Public School staff attended the ASIST Inservice Workshops. However, they were not included in the count if they had not completed the course. The Over/Under Representation Project served a total of 174 Boston Public School and non-Boston Public School staff. The Urban

project provided technical assistance and resource support to the senior staff of the Student Support Services. All three of the projects described above had begun staff development activities in previous years.

Not surprisingly, the 16 projects that reported serving staff primarily served special education service providers (826). But these federally funded projects also benefited 285 regular educators from the Boston Public Schools. Table 7, above, presents data on the staff the projects served. Two notes are necessary in order to understand and interpret this table correctly. First and foremost, as explained earlier, the data for staff was not put into the computer this year. Therefore, this data had to be hand-tabulated. Given the possibility of human error and calculation error, this data is less reliable than data that had been matched with the Department of Implementation file and then computerized. Secondly, the ASIST figures, which show 220 served, were not broken down into special education staff and regular education staff components. While these types are within Table 7, they are not included in any of the separate totals referring to regular or special education teachers. One should also note that the figure 220 is highly conservative. A considerably greater number of staff participated in at least some of these workshops, but they were not included

in the final count because they had not come to all of the workshops in a series. While their numbers could not be calculated, however, the benefits to the individuals not counted must not be overlooked.

PARENTS

Parent participation counts from the federally funded SPED projects were obtained by associating the parent with their child's student identification number. This method was used for three reasons. The first reason is that parents do not have comparable numbers. Secondly, it was felt that parents might find it intrusive to complete elaborate questionnaires concerning their own characteristics. Thirdly, it was felt that requests for detailed personal information might infringe upon confidentiality or inhibit participation.

There were essentially two of the eighteen projects which identified parents as their target client population. These two projects, the Parent Training in Severe Special Needs Project and the Parent Assistance and Information Project, concentrated their efforts on serving parents of students with special needs.

The Parent Training in Severe Special Needs Project served 55 parents over the course of this year. A partial breakdown of these parents included 12 White parents, 2 Oriental parents, 35 Hispanic parents, and 6

**Table 8: Distribution of Parent Participation in
Federally Funded Special Education Projects 1982**

	TOTAL OF PARENTS SERVED
PROJECTS	
P.L. 94-142	
Urban Project (4422)	
Parent Information/Assistance and Resource project (4424)	162
Four Special Assistance Student Support Services (4425)	
Planning, Policy and Evaluation Program (4426)	
Special Needs Alternative Education Program (4427)	12
Early Childhood Program (4428)	127
Career Instruction Managers (4429)	129
Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School (4430)	
Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan (4431)	
District Alternative Education Center (4432)	
P.L. 89-313	
Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents (3348)	
Language Assistance Project (3349)	179
Child Centered Therapy Model (3350)	
Parent Training In-Severe Special Needs (3379)	133
Career Occupational Ed for 502.4 Students (3380)	198
Hearing-Impaired Evaluation and Service (3381)	44
Support Services for Multi-Handicapped Students (3382)	1
Private ETL's (3382)	
TOTAL:	983

Black parents. All these clients were parents of developmentally disabled students who attended the Carter School or another community school. Services to these parents were time-intensive. They involved skill development work with parents in the home and in parent training groups.

The parent Assistance and Information Project primarily dealt with parent information, complaint management, and assistance. This project served 154 parents with only two staff members. The racial breakdown for parents was 14 White parents, 2 Oriental parents, 29 Hispanic parents, and 49 Black parents. In actuality, more than 154 parents participated. There are several reasons for this discrepancy. For one, because of the methodology involved, parents were not counted if they did not know or have their child's student I.D. number. Some parents served had children in parochial or private schools and so had no I.D. number. Other parents had children under the age of six in which case there was also no I.D. number. However, if a parent called to discuss a problem or to request information, the service was still provided although the parent was not counted. Secondly, many calls were anonymous because the parents did not wish to identify themselves. To respect this desire, their child's name and number were not requested. In a separate survey done by the project, 133 complaints

alone were made in 1981-1982. This figure compiled with figures derived from parent workshops and calls for information would place the total of parents served at close to three times the number matched with a student I.D. To guarantee a more accurate total next year, evaluation and project staff will assist in keeping dual counts. Also, the project will be provided with aid in collecting I.D. numbers from parents who did not provide them.

Overall, 632 parents were served during the portion of the year studied. Although the two projects described above were the only two for which parents were the target population, several other projects also served parents: The Language Assistance Project served 55 parents; the Career Occupational Education for 502.4 Students Project served 98 parents; the Hearing Impaired Evaluation and Service Project served 33 parents; the Special Education Alternative Education Program served 12; the Early Childhood Program served 102 parents while the Career Instruction Manager's Project served 129.

As explained above, certain information about the parents in these federally funded programs was gathered from student data. In so doing, some assumptions were made. For example, we assumed that the race of a student

and his parent was the same. Despite realizing that this situation is not always the case, we chose to make such generalizations so as not to overburden parents. Table 9 on page 36 provides the generalized racial distribution of parents served by the federally funded projects during the time period studied. One can see that essentially equal proportions of Black and White parents availed themselves for parent services. 107 Hispanic parents were similarly involved. Please note that there were two projects which set the goal of working specifically with Hispanic parents. These two projects, the Parent Training in Severe Special Needs Project and the Parent Assistance and Information Resource Project, served the largest number of parents in this racial category.

3.2 Types of Services Provided

In the preceding section of this report, participant characteristics were discussed. The figures given indicated totals for individuals served. In this section, we shift from looking at who was served to what types of services were provided. Therefore, totals in this section represent services provided (or service units) rather than people served.

Focusing on services changes the totals because

Table 9: Distribution of Parent Participation by Race
by Federally Funded Special Education Projects

PROJECT	AMERICAN INDIAN	BLACK	HISPANIC	ORIENTAL	OTHER	WHITE	TOTAL
P.L. 94-142							
Urban Project (4422)							
Parent Information/Assistance and Resource project (4424)	0	50	29	2	1	73	154
Four Special Assistance Student Support Services (4425)							
Planning, Policy and Evaluation Program (4426)							
Special Needs Alternative Education Program (4427)	0	5	0	0	1	6	12
Early Childhood Program (4428)	0	39	11	0	3	49	102
Career Instruction Managers (4429)	0	100	5	0	3	21	129
Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School (4430)							
Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan (4431)							
District Alternative Education Center (4432)							
P.L. 89-313							
Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents (3348)							
Language Assistance Project (3349)	0	6	35	2	0	12	55
Child Centered Therapy Model (3350)							
Parent Training In-Severe Special Needs (3379)	1	15	13	1	0	18	48
Career Occupational Ed for 502.4 Students (3380)	0	42	7	1	0	48	98
Hearing-Impaired Evaluation and Service (3381)	0	10	7	2	0	14	33
Support Services for Multi-Handicapped Students (3382)							
Private ETL's (3383)							
TOTAL:		267	107	8	8	241	632

any given participant could have received multiple services. Whereas there were 2,518 students served, there were 5,736 different services provided to them over the course of the 1981-1982 study period. Looking at service units both now and in the future can provide the school system with information about how money is being spent. The system will be able to review the cost of services in relation to the time being spent as well as review the most common types of services being provided across projects.

This section considers the types of services provided to students, staff and parents. One caution in interpreting this data is advised. This past year, the service codes were intentionally not defined. This lack of definition was designed to give the service providers a chance to try using these codes and to be able to base definitions on real experience. But by so doing, there were cases in which different projects used the same code to indicate different types of services. For example, the staff of one project (Career Information Managers) thought that "information dissemination" meant sending notices home to parents about meetings concerning their children. In the Parent Information and Assistance Project, "information dissemination" was considered to be intake, explanations of legal issues, follow-up and the provision of a list of resour-

ce people in other agencies. In 1982-1983, all direct and indirect service codes will be defined based on service provider use.

STUDENTS

In September of 1981, service providers and Project directors identified nineteen services they felt they were providing (see appendix for Service Codes). Over the course of the year several more were added. Table 10 on page 39 includes over 28. Those services most often provided to students across all projects include:

1. Support Services (792)
2. Teaching (602)
3. Individual Counseling (567)
4. Screening (475)
5. Occupational Placement (469)

Appropriately, support services and teaching were the services most frequently rendered to students. Teaching includes resource room group work, full educational programs and tutoring. Support services mean any support to a student in a special needs program. These supports include not only speech, OT, and PT but also problem-solving, general guidance, and program modification.

Next in order of incidence of services to students was "individual counseling." One of the difficulties this year in understanding what types of services this

Table 10: Distribution of Parent Participation by Services Received in
Federally Funded Special Education Projects 1982

	SCREENING 1	INTAKE 2	STUDENT PROGRAM REVIEW 3	ORIGINAL PROGRAM REVIEW 3	SPECIAL RE-EVALUATION (WITH ASSISTANCE TO MEET PROJECT GOALS) 4	SPECIALIZED ASSESSMENTS (TO MEET PROJECT GOALS) 5	OBSERVATION 6	GROUP WORKSHOP 7	INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING 10	CRISIS COUNSELING 11	SUPPORT SERVICE 12	TEACHING 15	SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM 16	WORKING TO MODIFY A STUDENT'S IEP 18	SERVICES TO PLACE A STUDENT IN AN OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM 19	OTHER 20	SERVICES TO RETRIEVE STUDENTS FROM PRIVATE PLACEMENTS 21	ATTEND 23	PLANNING CENTER 24	ENRICHMENT 25	MAINSTREAM 26	OVER-UNDER RECORD REVIEW - PAPER REVIEW 27	TOTAL				
P.L. 94-142																											
Urban Project (4422)																											
Parent Information/Assistance and Resource Project (4424)							77		1			10											88				
Four Special Assistance Student Support Services (4425)																											
Planning, Policy, and Evaluation Program (4426)																							90				
Special Needs Alternative Education Program (4427)																											
Early Childhood Program (4428)							228	6	5	21	8			35	21	8	8	8	2			301	110	666			
Career Instruction Managers (4429)							153	202	220	9	85	69	14	14			5	18						2636			
Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School (4430)					6								14	453		534	2	30	58	393	242	172	195	204	1091		
Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan (4431)														6		201	453			32				157	163		
District Alternative Education Center (4432)													45		81		84			27	5				241		
P.L. 89-313																											
Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents (3348)																											
Language Assistance Project (3349)							6			1						2	12		2		23			46			
Child Centered Therapy Model (3350)														14										14			
Parent Training in-Severe Special Needs (3379)						3																		5			
Career Occupational Ed for 502.4 Students (3380)											83		82								83			261			
Hearing-Impaired Evaluation and Service (3381)							9	2	42		2		16			23	43			9	3			200			
Support Services for Multi-Handicapped Students (3382)											28		28		17	12								56			
Private ETL's (3383)							2		4		29						9			35	42			121			
TOTAL:	9	475	204	272	15	135	191	14	150	45	86	567	8	792	602	18	30	85	469	175	255	195	204	301	157	110	5678

* No services listed for Code 14 Training Courses.

code encompassed was that the term included both psychological counseling and also career counseling. Despite the inclusion of the two types of counseling, the frequent use of this code indicates that a considerable amount of time was spent working with students on a one-to-one basis both to work out problems and to assist them in making career choices. Next, a considerable number of screenings took place. The majority of screening was done either in Early Childhood as an initial assessment to determine the appropriateness of a referral to special education or by Career Information Managers to determine the student's strengths and weaknesses in order to appropriately make career training and placement decisions. The inclusion of the occupational placements code in the category of services most commonly provided to students can be attributed to the Career Information Managers project. This project accounted for three hundred and ninety three (393) service units of the total number (469). Given the goals, size, and purpose of this project, it is not surprising that occupational placement would be one of the top five services. Interestingly, only two other projects cited this as a service provided to their clients.

Therefore, the most common direct services provided to students in these federally funded special education projects, were academic services and support services.

In some cases, support services represent the student's entire special educational program (as in the case of 502.4i projects). But in most cases, support services were an enhancement of the regular or special education program of the student in question.

STAFF

The range of services provided to staff can be found below on Table 11. Consistent with last years estimates, the services most often provided were in the form of workshops. These workshops concerned short-term topics specific to training and support. In Special Education, there was also considerable information dissemination, service provider consultancies, and project administration consultancies. Service provider consultancies involved general support to project and regular education staff. Project consultancies, on the other hand, included technical assistance and assistance in the administrative work required to design, develop, and implement new programs. It is important to keep in mind that the number of services provided to staff significantly exceeds the participants served because, for example, an individual could receive multiple services within a given project.

Table 11: Distribution of services provided to SPED, Regular BPS staff and Non-BPS Staff by Federally
Funded Special Education Project September - March 1982.

PROJECTS	SPED TEACHING STAFF							REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHING STAFF							OTHER NON-BPS STAFF							TOTAL					
	INFORMATION DISSEMINATION	WORKSHOP	COURSE	PROGRAM	STUDENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	SERVICE PROVIDERS ASSISTANCE	PROJECT ADMINISTRATION CONSULTANCY	OTHER	INFORMATION DISSEMINATION	WORKSHOP	COURSE	PROGRAM	STUDENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	SERVICE PROVIDERS ASSISTANCE	PROJECT ADMINISTRATION CONSULTANCY	OTHER	INFORMATION DISSEMINATION	WORKSHOP	COURSE	PROGRAM	STUDENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		SERVICE PROVIDERS ASSISTANCE	PROJECT ADMINISTRATION CONSULTANCY	OTHER		
P.L. 94-142																											
Urban Project (4422)																											
Parent Information/Assistance and Resource project (4424)					1																						
Four Special Assistance Student Support Services (4425)																									3		
Planning, Policy and Evaluation Programs (4426)																											
Special Needs Alternative Education Program (4427)																											
Early Childhood Program (4428)					15	128		11	15	36	17		54	160		29	14	49		5	4	61		4	3	48	7
Career Instruction Managers (4429)					29	8				18	8		16	12				72								653	
Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School (4430)																										195	
Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan (4431)						74																					
District Alternative Education Center (4432)																	6					6		5		3	8
P.L. 89-313																											
Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents (3348)																											
Language Assistance Project (3349)					17	63					18	18	2		2								1			2	123
Child Centered Therapy Model (3350)						16					4	7			2								5			2	36
Parent Training In-Severe Special Needs (3379)																											
Career Occupational Ed for 502.4 Students (3380)					22	78		22	22	4	0												1			2	151
Hearing-Impaired Evaluation and service (3381)					18	57				12	17	17		2									9			2	135
Support Services for Multi-Handicapped Students (3382)						41			2		2	1														2	46
Private ETL's (3383)																											
TOTAL	104	465	0	33	39	96	99	20	70	178	0	29	14	127	0	5	48	83	0	9	3	81	12	0	1433		

PARENTS

Generally, the types of services provided to parents were topic-specific workshops, parent support groups, information dissemination, and/or through any one of these, complaint management support. Complaint Management Support is discussed in the Parent Information and Assistance Project report in more detail.

It must be made clear that the 632 parents listed as served by these projects were parents who came to the projects and were provided with specific services. Innumerable other parents received benefits and indirect services in the course of services given to their children. Therefore, the number 632 should only be seen as a portion of the actual number of parents who benefited from the provision of services through the federally funded projects. The 632 parents served by the projects listed below in Table 12 were provided with services specifically and directly designed for them. Therefore, they received more individually tailored support as a result of initiating contact with a given project.

3.3 Appropriateness, Impact and Benefit of Investment

In this section three issues will be discussed: whether these funds were spent within the federal

TABLE 12: Distribution of Parent Participation by
Services Received in Federally Funded Special Education Projects 1982

Projects	INFORMATION DISSEMINATION 1	WORKSHOP 2	COURSE 3	PROGRAM TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE 4	STUDENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE 5	SERVICE PROVIDER ASSISTANCE 6	PROJECT PROVIDERS ASSISTANCE 7	PARENT ADMINISTRATION CONSULTANCY 8	PARENT ASSISTANCE 9	PRIVATE COUNSELING 10	SUPPORT SERVICES 11	SERVICE PROVIDER CONSULTANCY 12	OTHER 13	TOTALS
P.L. 94-142														
Urban Project (4422)					53					109				1 162
Parent Information/Assistance and Resource project (4424)														
Four Special Assistance Student Support Services (4425)														
Planning, Policy and Evaluation Program (4426)														12
Special Needs Alternative Education Program (4427)											12			127
Early Childhood Program (4428)					110			17						129
Career Instruction Managers (4429)				129										
Pre-Vocational Program - McKinley School (4430)														
Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan (4431)														
District Alternative Education Center (4432)														
P.L. 89-313														
Summer Tutor Training Program for Deaf Adolescents (3348)											42	24	17	179
Language Assistance Project (3349)			70	12	14									
Child Centered Therapy Model (3350)														38 133
Parent Training In-Severe Special Needs (3379)					23		18	10		12	10	21		198
Career Occupational Ed for 502.4 Students (3380)			167	23							8			11 44
Hearing-Impaired Evaluation and Service (3381)			8									25		1 1
Support Services for Multi-Handicapped Students (3382)														
Private ETL's														
TOTAL:	373	221	14	18	27					121	72	70	17	67 983

Microfilmed From
Best Available Copy

penditures has been, and finally, what types of benefits have been derived from the actions taken by Boston in spending these funds.

The first issue, the appropriateness of these expenditures, is described in terms of four criteria. First, were the intended recipients of these funds served? Secondly, were Boston's choices of which projects developed consistent with established priorities? Was the mandate of using these funds to establish new programs to enhance Student Support Services taken into consideration, and have these funds been used to respond to the unique and evolving needs of the community?

Appropriateness of Investments

As stated early in this report, the P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313 funds were provided to serve eligible special needs students. They did not have to be equally distributed across all eligible students. The Boston Public Schools serves over 2,518 students in various ways with these funds. Indirectly, it serves an additional 632 students by helping the parents of these special needs youngsters with questions and support. Finally, by serving 1,535 Boston Public School staff, innumerable other students are indirectly served. There is little question that by serving over a quarter of the special needs students in the system, the broad guidelines regarding who

should be served have been met.

Because these funds are seen as developmental rather than to maintenance funds, the legislation is explicit about specific priorities regarding whom funds should be concentrated. Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) are required to seek out and serve those students who are unserved and the most severely disabled who are underserved. Clearly, who these students will be varies from LEA to LEA. Traditionally, though, students younger than 6 and older than 16 have had fewer programs designed for their needs because historically, the Public Schools have not been legally required to serve these learners. With these federally funded programs Boston is now serving its oldest and youngest special needs students. This development is consistent with the mandate. More specifically, Boston serves teenagers concentrating on career and employment training and academic support. Furthermore, this year's analysis indicates that the School system is also serving at least 90 students who have already left school but who are still within the legal age range for public education services. The criteria of serving the least served and the underserved, therefore, has likewise been met. However, for the future, the Student Support Services Department needs to develop policies concerning how to determine who constitutes "the least served and underserved".

The question of whether federal funds are used as 'start-up' funds to initiate new programs and then redirected to other needs recognized by the community is complicated. First, in a general sense, the programs developed with these funds were all created to respond to needs within the BPS Student Support Services Department range of services. Also, these programs were developed in response to expressed concerns, or needs, identified by the State Educational Agency and Courts through audits and other actions. Given that none of the Federally Funded Projects have existed for more than four years, one could still say they were all in various stages of 'start-up'. But at this point, Boston must begin to look at which of the federal programs funded through these federal funds can now be assumed by local funding. While consistent with the laws in question this could also "free-up" these federal funds to respond to new and evolving community needs.

Impact of Investments

Besides the appropriateness of these investments, there is much that can be said this year about their impact. First, over a quarter of the Student Support Services students have participated in one or more of these programs. Second, regular educators as well as

regular education students have been served by these funds to assist in keeping students from unnecessarily being placed in special education programs. This occurred, for example, for 213 Early Childhood students. Third, the capacity of the community to serve its special needs students had been enhanced by the addition of many new programs. For example, these funds have helped to establish early childhood screening programs, a formalized parent complaint system, career education opportunities and counseling, sheltered workshop job placement opportunities, counseling and social work support for special needs students as well as two substantially separate day schools to assist in keeping students from more restrictive and costly outside placements. A comprehensive staff development program has been mounted. Staff have received inservice training courses, support, counseling and technical assistance. Parents have been provided with information and workshops to increase their skills in understanding and working with their special needs students and the school system. These impacts and benefits to the student and community are important and are considerable impacts for these dollars. But they respond to only one facet of impact: what is new or what has been added. The question of quality of these services must still be addressed, and it is to this issue we now turn.

Benefits of Investments:

Across projects the general appropriateness of expenditures and the general aspects of their impact have been established. It is within projects as well as across projects that the quality of these impacts must be scrutinized. In section four of this report, project-by-project reports outline the extent to which set goals and objectives were met. Furthermore, in the quality of education mini-research projects, a more comprehensive look at what has been accomplished is found. Several other steps were taken this year to look beyond the quantitative data of how many received what type of services toward the impacts and benefits (or the quality) of what was being provided. Two approaches were taken:

1. Through the Participant Service Reports, service providers were asked to establish objectives for why they were providing a given service and were asked to establish criteria to measure their success at achieving their target objectives.
2. Through a pilot verification process, participants were surveyed to solicit their reaction to/and satisfaction with services and to verify the receipt of such services.

These two efforts assisted us in determining changes

in behavior and attitude as perceived by participants and, by using criteria and objectives, as perceived by staff. Each of these efforts is described in detail in the following pages. Each represents the first experimental step towards looking at quality from within the context of a sound quantitative information base.

Participant Service Reports

Objectives Accomplished:

The Participant Service Reports include the goal of the individual project, the service being provided, and the duration of the service provision. These reports also include a section on the objective to be accomplished by providing said service. It is this last section which relates to the benefit, or quality, of the federal investment.

In the objective section, by establishing objective criteria, the service provider was asked to estimate the baseline, the beginning point of a participant accomplishing an objective. The provider was then asked to make a target estimate, or the percentage of change they hoped to accomplish. Finally, based on initially established criteria, the provider was asked to state what was actually accomplished. If, for example, the objective for providing students with counseling was to increase their school attendance, then if their average

attendance rate was 50%, the baseline would be 50%. Given available counseling time and the student's past attendance record, a realistic target might be set at 75%. 75% would indicate an improvement, or change, of 25%. If, after the service was rendered, the student's attendance improved from only 2.5 days per week to 3 days, then the actual improvement was from the 50% baseline to 60% or 70%. The change then was 15% less than the target estimate.

For this system to work, criteria to determine movement from baseline to target to actual are needed. Realistic objectives also need to be established. In 1981-1982, in order to establish measurable objectives, service providers were asked to set the criteria upon which success would be based. For the most part, objectives were set and baselines, targets, and actuals were completed. In some cases, however, the actual was not completed because reports were collected prior to the actual information being known. For those completed, it is interesting to note that providers invariably recorded that they had achieved the targeted percentage change. While such a level of success is sought, the lack of variability between what everyone hoped to accomplish and what they stated was accomplished leads one to question the validity of the stated results. Perhaps there was inadequate understanding of and insufficient training in this system

for its use to have provided a realistic assessment of objective accomplishments. Comments from the field, particularly from the Users Task Force, suggest that since the procedure was unfamiliar this year, perhaps staff set a target and made the actual agree.

Because of the above-stated difficulty, an analysis of this information was not done. Plans for increasing training within particular projects will be undertaken in 1982-1983. This training will serve as a model for other projects. Although the objective section of the Participant Service Report was less successful than we had hoped, it provided an important foundation. Staff were afforded the opportunity to think through their objective and how successful they were regarding the accomplishments of specific participants. Consequently, the objective section will not be abandoned. Instead we will work more slowly to develop each project's capacity to complete this section in a realistic and meaningful manner.

Although Objective Accomplishments were not analyzed, we did secure information as to the incidence of student objectives and the ones most commonly identified. Table 13, page 53, provides the reader with this information by project and for all the projects.

Pilot Verification Process

Verification of Student and Parent Participation in Federally Funded Projects Through Telephone Interviews*

The purpose of this section is to describe the procedure used to verify the services delivered by eleven of the eighteen federally funded projects to students and their parents from September through December 1981. The other projects are not represented here either because they had not provided direct services by December or they were not designed to do so; hence, verification was inappropriate.

This pilot verification effort was designed to assist us in confirming the accuracy of data submitted by service providers, to assist the evaluation staff in determining the most accurate means of verifying data, and finally, to solicit participants' (parents, students, and staff) reactions and perceptions to services provided to them. As a pilot effort, this process forms the basis from which a more reliable verification process will be developed in the future.

Method

The initial procedure used in this verification effort was to randomly select sixty-seven parents ser-

* The data for this section was collected and analyzed by Mr. Frederick Houston.

ved by the federally funded projects. While selection was random, distribution across projects was considered as was the duration of service being verified. More specifically, only services for which parents or students received substantial service time were considered for verification. This sample included two subgroups of participant types. The first were parents who directly received the service themselves. The second were parents whose children had been the recipients of a federally funded service. The participants were then interviewed by telephone using the same survey format for each interview. All interviews were conducted by the same interviewer. A copy of the interview schedule can be found in the appendix.

Caveat:

The verification procedure was inhibited by obstacles encountered in trying to contact parents as well as by difficulties with missing data. Data needed to reach parents often was not found in examining the student's master file at the Department of Implementation. This was true in twenty-six of the sixty-eight cases reviewed. Also, there was approximately a twenty-percent incidence of incorrect data found in the master file. In general, the major problem with the master file was lack of current information rather than in-

correct information.

A second caveat in interpreting these verification findings is that on the whole, parents who directly received services themselves found it easier to confirm, describe, and converse about the services they had received. However, parents whose children had received the service directly (for example, career counseling, individual tutoring, screening, or group counseling) knew considerably less about the services being provided under the auspices of these federally funded programs. In these cases, it was often necessary to "cue" the parents by providing them with the service provider's name, the name of the project, and the service that was provided to the child. Any parent interviewed who could not remember the service provider was given standard "cues". In general, cues were needed more often for parents whose children were the primary recipients in one of the projects.

Table 14, "Verification Efforts: Participation in Federally Funded Projects through Interviews with Parents September- December 1981," is on page 57. It provides information on how many parents were called. Of those parents reached, it provides data on how many were able to verify and discuss the services provided by project staff.

Of the sixty-eight potential interviews, thirty-

**Table 14: Verification Effort: Participation in Federally Funded Projects through Interviews
with Parents September - December 1981.**

PROJECT NUMBERS AND TITLES

	Interviewees Verification of Services	Interviewees Unfamiliar with Services	Incomplete Interviews	Insufficient Data to Conduct Interviews
P.L. 89-313				
3349 = Language Assistance Program	5		2	
3350 = Child. Ctr'd Therapy Program				
3379 = Parent Training In-Severe Special Needs	3			1
3380 = Career Occ. Ed. for 502.4 Students	2		1	2
3381 = Hearing Impaired Eval./Service	2		1	1
3383 = Private ETL's	2		1	5
Sub-Total	14	2	5	9
P.L. 94-142				
4424 = Parent Information/Assistance and Res. Program	3	1		
4428 = Early Childhood Program	2	1		
4429 = Career Instruction Managers	0	2	3	7
4430 = Pre-Voc. Program - McKinley Sch	2	0	1	
4431 = Over/Under Rep. Remed. Plan	2	2		6
4432 = District Alternative Ed. Center			2	4
Sub-Total	9	6	6	17
Grand-Total	23	8	11	26
73				74

one were conducted. It is important to note that with a fifty-percent rate of non-contact with the original sixty-eight families findings must be guardedly interpreted. It is also important to realize that despite concerted effort (multiple attempts both in day and evening), the lack of sufficient data and the difficulty in reaching parents works against verification efforts which are heavily reliant on telephone contact.

Twenty-three(23) or seventy-four percent of the parents who were ultimately contacted verified that the service received was as described by the service provider. The other eight families who were contacted were unfamiliar with the service provided as well as with the service provider. This lack of familiarity in and of itself does not constitute enough evidence to indicate that the service was, in fact, not provided. Rather, it only indicates that the parent was unfamiliar with the service provided and with the project and service staff in question. All but one of the parents who verified services were positive feedback about the service provided. Their comments specifically revolved around satisfaction with the service and satisfaction with the individual staff person providing that service. In the other case where the service was verified, the parent was dissatisfied with the project. This parent

spoke of a vocational component to the project that had not materialized until late October or early November. While the parent was very dissatisfied with this, she readily admitted that it was not entirely the fault of the project. The funding had been there, but finding a vocation teacher to fill the position had proven difficult and time-consuming.

Parent Comments

The duration of these telephone interviews was between a half an hour and an hour. Questions revolved primarily around the description of the service being provided and the parent's satisfaction with that service. The following quotes represent the essence of the interviews as they pertain to verifying the service which was provided and reaction to that service. Their comments and anecdotes about the Boston Public Schools and Chapter 766 Special Education Services, while gathered and recorded, are not included here. The following quotes are brief and were chosen as a representative sample of the general tone of this interview.

Language Assistance (P=Parent)

P1: "If it wasn't for the program, I would have cracked up by now."

- P2: "I can now communicate with my daughter a little."
- P3: "There is no problem with the service. Only the transportation for my daughter sometimes doesn't come."
- P4: "I have learned some sign language and about various aspects of special education."
- P5: "Meetings are good, but the information about meetings is sometimes sent with the children as messenger, and they often lose it. Consequently, the message doesn't reach the parent."

Parent Training In Severe Special Needs

- P6: "I have learned how to maximize my participation effectively at CORE evaluation."
- P7: "Judy teaches parents how to reinforce what is taught in school."
- P8: "The project is OK, but the school cut on aid. There were two aides to one teacher but now there is one aide to each teacher."

Career and Occupational Education for 502.4 Students

- P9: "The assessments and evaluations help me see where my daughter has improved."
- P10: "Jennifer has been excellent. Before her arrival at the school, the staff and aides were careful not to use sign language. She taught them how to use it. All of the parents have her home phone number and she is open to all questions."

Hearing Impaired Education/Work-Study Coordinators

- P11: "My son is much more alert, completes his homework, and is more studious."
- P12: "He can speak better and put his sentences together although he feels that he is not learning enough."

Private School Evaluation Teamleaders

- P13: "The teachers at Hyde Park High School had said he was doing better although he was suspended today."
- P14: "I am not familiar with the service provider or the program."
- P15: "My daughter likes the McKinley School, and she is taking plumbing."
- P16: "My social worker was involved with the transfer and not me."

Parent Information and Resource Project

- P17: "I received literature about special education but did not attend any meetings."
- P18: "I did receive some flyer about special education meetings, but I did not go to any."
- P19: "I do not know anything about any information being passed along about meetings or special education between September through December 1981 although I do know Noreen Curran."
- P20: "I received information about special education from them."

(Interviewer's note: In general, parents knew of the service providers but were somewhat vague about the services).

Early Childhood Program Development and Technical Assistance Project

- P21: "The program was beneficial. A child advocate and an occupational specialist were guest speakers. However, there was a lack of transportation for my child."
- P22: "I am not familiar with Marilyn Bernstein or the Early Childhood Project."
- P23: "The project made it easier to deal with my child at home. If the meetings were in the evening, more parents would have attended."

Career Instruction Managers

- P24: "I am unfamiliar with the program, Ed Roberts, Judy Cummings, Max Corbett and Evelyn Dangler."
- P25: "I do not know anything about the program or the people who run it."

McKinley School Prevocational/Satellite Program

- P26: "The prevocational part of the program was adequate, but the academic part was not enough. At the beginning, there was no prevocational teacher until October. After the academic part the children who walked to school were dismissed at 10:30 a.m., and those who were bused had to stay in the office until 2 o'clock. I feel as though the teacher wasn't teaching him/her academics. When he complains he cannot read the book, the teacher makes no effort to help him."
- P27: "The McKinley School program is very good. When my son entered the school, he was on addition, and now he is on fractions. His reading has also improved."

Over/Under Representation Project

- P28: "I am not familiar with the service provider, but I am somewhat familiar with the program."
- P29: "I am not familiar with Idola Williams or the Over/Under Representation."
- P30: "I have learned about special education issues."
- P31: "I am not familiar with the program or Idola Williams, and I did attend the Review."

While these pieces of information are only random comments and must not be generalized, this first pilot effort at verifying service and soliciting parents' comments does suggests some emerging themes. First, while parents know about the service provided to them and their children,

they do not, understandably, always distinguish between the federally funded components and other aspects of the services being provided by the Boston Public Schools. The federal services are considered part of the whole and are not seen as distinct special projects. Services are considered, at least as articulated by these parents, as adequate and appropriate. In general, they appear to have had positive impacts on both parents and children with special needs. Nonetheless, these comments cannot be construed as meaning total parental satisfaction with their child's educational plan or with the Boston Public Schools in general. It was not the intent of this effort to solicit such reactions.

Second, the personality of certain service providers appears to be a key factor in the descriptions of satisfaction. Parents who were called "liked" the project staff with whom their children worked. This fact suggests both a potential strength and a potential weakness of these programs. First and foremost, the strength of these programs, at least in part, lies in the parents' confidence and positive relationship with the staff providing the services. While true, one of the frustrations within the design of many of these projects is that staff leave and because of funding delays, replacements are delayed in being hired. These changes due to fiscal bureaucratic issues

often leave projects foundering for some portion of the year (ex: Special Education Alternative Education Program). Parents who have been satisfied with service providers in the past can be frustrated by changes in programs that they expect to remain stable from year to year.

Finally, although this was a relatively small sample and only a pilot effort, the fact that out of sixty plus families only fifty percent of them were able to be reached appears significant to these investigators. Difficulty in contacting parents must be seen as a barrier to follow-up and to verification efforts in general. Alternative strategies of soliciting impact data from the participants of these federally funded projects as well as of other services provided by the Student Services Department need to be seriously considered. Irregardless, the general response of those families contacted, especially given the random nature of the sample, would suggest that these services have been provided as indicated by service provision staff and that parents, when contacted about specific services provided, are able to verify this provision of service. Parents also commented in an essentially positive manner regarding the quality and benefits of this participation. However, based on this pilot effort and on comments from project staff about this effort, certain procedural changes will have to be made. The following are plans for the

future:

1. A larger sample size will be interviewed regardless of the number of parents initially attempted to be contacted. This sample will be representative of those receiving services not only in the first half of the year but also in the second half of the year. Also, in order to get a clearer perspective on project quality, the sample will be chosen so as to be representative of the total population being served.
2. Parents will be notified at the beginning of the year that a verification process will be undertaken in January and February of the following academic year. They will be notified by a letter written by the Evaluation staff which, in turn, will be distributed by the Project Directors and Project Staff. This notification should facilitate the interview procedures. This year, probably because of the time that elapsed between the provision of service and the follow-up telephone call, some parents had to be cued for total or partial recall. We hope that this notification will reduce the need for cueing during the interviews.

3. Every project will not only have telephone verification interviews but will also have site visits conducted throughout the year. These visits should guarantee that data provided by parents and staff is interpreted with an understanding of its context.
4. A closer relationship between service providers and evaluation staff will be developed. The evaluation staff will meet with direct service providers and project directors at the beginning of the year. They will give a detailed explanation of evaluation procedures, solicit from them the most appropriate method by which to understand their data, and also solicit ideas as to the best way of verifying and securing feedback from the participants receiving services.
5. Staff will be informed of the limits of the use of the Master File as a source for data. There has been a relatively high incidence of dated data and, to a much lesser degree, an incidence of incorrect data. To facilitate the verification process, staff must understand this system.

4.1 Organization of Project Reports

The project Reports are discussed in section 4.3 of this final report. Each project report is organized in the same manner. It is divided into four sections: Objective Sheet Highlights, Participation Reports, Quality of Education Questions, and Comments/Conclusions/Recommendations.

In the Objective Sheet Highlights, Section I, Project Directors give a general summation of the accomplishments and problems experienced during the course of the year. This section provides a context for understanding other types of data.

Section II provides participation information. This information has been derived from computerized service reports. They reveal who has participated in each project, be they student, staff, or parent. They also display what types of services were generally received and for what period of time.

Section III of each project report is comprised of the quality of education question. The question was designed as a "mini-research" project to examine the quality and impact of each project. Unfortunately, the content of section III varied highly among the project reports. In some cases, no data was received by the Evaluation Staff. In these reports there are explana-

Microfilmed From
Best Available Copy

tions from the Project Directors relative to the quality of education question effort. These explanations include some data and findings on why there is none. However, there were more exemplary projects such as the Hearing Impaired Projects (3349,3350,3381), The Early Childhood Enrichment Program (4428), The Private ETLs Project (3383), Parent Training in Severe Special Needs (3379), and the Parent Assist Project (4424). These projects invested significant time and effort to produce useful data that substantiated the quality and impact of the project in question while identifying areas in need of improvement.

Conclusions, recommendations and observations formed by the Evaluation Staff constitute Section IV of each project report. These comments stem from the data produced or, conversely in some cases, from the lack of data produced.

4.2 Discussion and Findings of Project Reports

Up to this point, this report has taken a general look at these eighteen federally projects in terms of the participants, the types of services they received, and the impact of those services. However, it is also important to consider the extent to which each project fulfilled its objectives. This section will provide

general information derived from the project reports. The next section, section 4.3, will allow for a closer examination of each project as the project reports themselves are displayed.

In looking at section 4.2 of last year's final report, one will note that the area of objective achievement was of concern. It should not be construed that each project did not meet with various types of successes. Rather, there was considerable discrepancy between the original written objectives and the de facto operation of each project. This year, however, the gap between the stated and the actual is less wide. For the most part, the projects set their goals, responded to and worked toward them. The theme had exceptions: for example one exception was the Over/Under Representation Project. This project continued to use the nine elements of the State Educational Agency prima facie plan. However, for the objective-setting purposes of these federally funded projects, the prima facie plan does not provide a narrow enough focus. It would be more useful in terms of project activity and evaluation if each project designed its own goals.

In the course of fulfilling its objectives, each project was responsible for a great deal of record keeping. A common theme expressed was dissatisfaction rela-

tive to the usefulness of this extensive record keeping and the time required to do so. One can sympathize with this concern. And it is a valid concern, particularly in a start-up year. Nonetheless, documentation is a necessity. Not only is it legally mandated, but it is also critical in terms of substantiating accomplishments and justifying expenditures. If, for example, large projects (those spending in excess of \$ 130,000) in federal funds, they should be able to account for the expenditure of those monies and the results of those expenditures. Furthermore, they must do so in a reliable and consistent manner. Projects which did not provide such documentation will be carefully examined to discern why such fundamental information was not issued.

Another recurring theme among the projects was that of dissatisfaction with certain aspects of the bureaucracy; namely, complaints revolving around time spent cutting thorough red tape in order to start up projects and hire staff. This is a very real problem, one that is not merely limited to the Student Support Services Department. It is a system-wide problem in need of continued attention on a variety of professional levels. In order to implement projects in the most expeditious manner possible, this difficulty must be resolved. If certain projects were to consistently lag in their start-up, careful investigation would be recommended so as to

determine why adaptive strategies had not been developed by them.

This year, however, strategies were developed to measure the benefits and impacts of the projects. This area demonstrates a marked improvement since the previous year. These efforts have been discussed in earlier sections of this final report and will be echoed in the individual project reports. For example, one of the ways this effort materialized was through the pilot verification process. Clearly, then, the necessary shift from tracking quantitative data toward tracking qualitative data is underway.

Tracking qualitative data has allowed for a more indepth understanding of the models involved in the formulation of these projects. Last year's report expressed concern that within many of these projects, models of national import might exist that, to a certain degree, had been overlooked. Procedures for movement to a least restrictive environment, procedures for how best to involve parents of special needs students in their child's educational program, and procedures for determining what might be the most beneficial work-related experience for special needs students were areas considered to hold promise of national significance. This year, each of these areas was examined more closely. Unfortunately, a comprehensive examination of career em-

ployment information was completed. But the first two areas proved exemplary. The presentation and publication of these models are currently under consideration.

This year, computerization has helped provide time to concentrate more on quality rather than on quantity in these federally funded projects. Although much work is left to be done, a significant amount of headway has been made.

4.3 Project Reports

5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

This report represents the second year in a process to develop a model for tracking and reviewing information about federally funded programs in special education within the Boston Public Schools. As such, this process is an evolving one, each year improving and refining to lead to reliable information about who is participating in these projects, as well as characteristics about these participants and the benefits to them. The development of this model, besides providing increasingly more reliable information about federally funded projects, is undertaken with the anticipation that eventually this model will be used as the basis for examining other locally funded aspects of the service delivery system. By looking at the Tables within this report, the reader is given credible information (as opposed to last year's estimates) of who participated in Boston's P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313 projects. The reader can understand some of the characteristics of the major participant group- students (such as distribution by race, sex, age, and types of special education placements) of these participants. They can see how project priorities are consistent with the mandates established by the laws under which these programs are funded. This report also describes in some detail the general strengths and weaknesses of specific projects, as determined by contextual narratives - (objective sheets developed by project directors) as well as

through mini research projects (or quality of education studies). This latter information provides us with an increasingly refined and indepth insight into project impacts and outcomes. As the aggregate data becomes more reliable, it recomfirms that the Boston Public School's expenditures of these funds are generally consistent with the parameters set forth under the federal guidelines (specifically Section 612-613 in the Education of All Handicapped Children Act).

While this year substantial steps have been taken to improve the precision and reliability of aggregate data as well as the understanding of the impact and outcomes of these projects, steps to go further have been hampered and delayed by bureaucratic snags and delays in processing this information. While frustrating, the ultimate results and goals for this year have been obtained. Next year, continued refinements and more ready access to computer analysis will assist in improving this model and providing better information for planning as well as for evaluation purposes. Generally, these projects have proven to represent additions to and enhancements of special education services to students in the Boston Public Schools. The projects are ongoing and, as such, are stabilized but need to be reviewed from the viewpoint of components of the service delivery system as opposed to discrete changing projects.

Given this year's experience, project directors and

project staff should increasingly become freed up from the task of collecting participation data and types of service information so they can concentrate on looking next year at quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of these investments. What this year's efforts have done is to refine baseline data so that we are at the threshold of understanding these investments in terms of specific students served. The groundwork from last year has further been refined, and the direction of concentrating on quality has strongly been established. To best understand the continuing plan presented in last year's final report, it is reviewed here.

- I. Fiscal year 1980-1981--Last year what we had accomplished was to identify the projects, the level of investment of each project, the varieties and types of participants, their characteristics, and services provided. In the process we essentially mapped out the needs for the upcoming years and identified the appropriate priority for next year "to establish a system by which the baseline data can more easily be collected (without inordinate amounts of time on the part of project staff and project directors), so that more time can be spent on concentrating on looking at general quality of projects, as well as outcome."
- II. Fiscal year 1981-1982--This year, we have had the opportunity to automate (through the use of the computer) baseline data for students and parents. With the name of the project, the project staff, student and student I.D. number, all of the data from tables 1 through 7 will be available upon request. Secondly, by setting up a simple form to gather information about the types of services (and the full-time equivalent service units) we will likewise be able to gather information through the computer about the amounts of money spent on the provision of various types of services. Third, simultaneously with the creation of this type of instrument, we will also be able (by developing codes to describe criteria for success) to begin to experiment with looking at program and student outcomes. Fourth, short reports prepared by the project directors and staff will

therefore only have to concentrate on describing objectives and the extent to which they are met, raising questions of import about the value, success and quality of each project, collecting consistent data throughout the year to answer those questions, and establishing criteria within each project so as to judge the success of that project by the project's own standards.

What must be understood in considering what is possible next year is that while a file can be established for evaluation of the projects, and while data by project directors and staff can be collected on the types of services provided by each project, connecting this information up with student files will not be possible until all students receiving special education services in the Boston Public School system have been entered into the computer. This process in and of itself will take approximately a year. Therefore, we cannot examine the full fruits of next year's labor until the following year or year three, to understand and to look carefully at what we've been able to create in terms of a system able to assess not only project, but also individual student success.

- III. Fiscal year 1982-1983--By the third year of this process we will have the first opportunity (with information on both students and projects in the computer) to implement the entire documentation evaluation model.

Based on the information collected in the previous year and also based on periodic reports which will be produced in this third year, refinements in reports in the model can be made. Further narrowing of our scope to concentrate on the quality of services provided can be the goal. The ultimate key to understanding the success of these projects, and to determining which projects should continue to be funded and which should not, is the establishment of criteria for determining the success, benefits and outcomes to participant groups. This automatically leads into an examination of criteria for determining general success of the overall service delivery system. For example, if a specific number of projects determine that the best way to track and monitor their success is by the successful completion of IEPs for students participating in this project, this will ultimately mean the examination of the IEPs themselves and an assessment of the extent to which there is a connection between the successful completion of those IEPs, the services being provided in general special education, and the specific services provided through the project.

IV. Fiscal year 1982-1984--With a full year of data and experience on the projects, as well as on all the services provided to special needs students in Boston Public Schools, careful analysis of outcomes can be assessed and ascertained. Based on this analysis, recommendations and a plan can be developed for a fifth year which looks not only at the federal funded projects and the SEA reimbursement (Chapter 766) but also, by examining the entire service delivery system looks at the investment of local dollars in special education.

In general, despite delays and compromises due to lack of timely access to (and/or inaccurate) information, resistance from project staff, and the lack of submission of data on the quality of education question, recommendations within project reports as well as general across-project recommendations come from a much stronger data base than in past years. In the future, emphasis will increasingly fall on looking at quality criteria within projects. The model will be maintained in terms of its individual parts, objective sheets, participant service reports and quality of education research project. Maintaining, while refining, these three pieces of the model will lessen the burden of staff as they are becoming more familiar with the expectations for evaluation. While true, a renewed commitment to fulfilling the requirements of this evaluation process is necessary. The Student Support Services Department and the school system generally must reaffirm its commitment to making such activities a priority. Towards these ends, the following recommendations are made:

1. Race/sex data of student participants must be monitored project-by-project by project directors and across projects by evaluation staff throughout the year. Policy statements explaining these figures must be developed by

each project to guarantee that the disproportions are not occurring intentionally, denying the equal educational opportunity of individual students or groups. Understanding of criteria for participation within federally funded projects must be clearly and explicitly non discriminatory.

2. Project goals, objectives, and evaluation procedures need to be established prior to the beginning of the academic year for all projects. Refinements of goals and objectives within the first month are reasonable. After this time, goals and evaluation procedures should be adhered to and used as the basis for evaluating the effectiveness of projects. Projects which will not be following standard evaluation procedures (i.e., submitting semi-annual objective sheets, participant service reports, and quality of education research projects) must be determined prior to September. Specifically, evaluation procedures should be established prior to the beginning of the year for the Urban Project; the Policy, Planning and Evaluation Project; and the four special Assistant's Projects. It is recommended that standard evaluation procedures be employed in the case of the Four Assistants and the Policy Planning and Evaluation Project. The Urban Project should maintain its own documentation and present that at the end annually as it did in 1981-1982.
3. Data collection of evaluation information should be carried out semi-annually in December (December 10) and in May (May

- 13). Collecting data twice a year at these particular points decreases the burden on project staff, and also provides maximum data and adequate time for analysis for timely interim and final reports.
4. Questions concerning the sufficiency of data and accuracy of data in the Student Master File have been raised through this report. It is suggested that the Student Support Services manager request a quality control study of this file to determine how to interpret data which is derived from this source.
5. The quality of education question concerning the parent complaint system raised the broader question of how complaints from parents are generally handled throughout the Student Support Services department. It is recommended that a survey of all units within the Student Support Services be conducted to determine parent complaint procedures. Further specifically, in cases considered at risk for continuing problems standard operating parent procedures should be established. Such a complaint system should include general logging in of complaints, tracking and routing of complaints with follow-up in specific cases at set intervals.
6. As suggested throughout this report (in the verification section, and in various quality of education reports) evaluation researchers found it very difficult to contact parents. Despite concerted efforts, (calling

during the daytime, in the evenings, leaving call-back numbers daytime and evening) less than 50% success rate was obtained. It is recommended that the Student Support Services Department perhaps in conjunction with the superintendent's office and with technical assistance from State Regional Office, research the successful means of contacting parents, particularly in relationship to follow-up surveys. Recommendations of innovative strategies should be researched and such recommendations should be forwarded in a memo from the Evaluation Unit to the Manager of the Student Support Services.

7. For the past two years, project priorities have suggested serving underserved and unserved students. But the time is approaching when the Boston Public Schools should consider local financial support projects which have been tested over the course of the last three years. Assuming this responsibility is consistent with legislative mandates concerning these funds. To do so would also "free up" federally funded dollars to apply to new priorities which have evolved over the past three years. The Early Childhood Project and the Parent Training Project in Severe Special Needs are two examples of well organized, well run, and stable projects. Each of these contributes significantly to the quality and variety of services provided to special needs students in the Boston Public schools. Support by local dollars would increase their stability and guarantee

continued high quality services.

8. Briefing senior staff on a regular basis about evaluation procedures and findings should be continued next year as it has been in the past. These briefings should be no less than on a quarterly basis and should be designed to assist the evaluation staff and the senior staff as they monitor to assess project activities and effectiveness.
9. Last year's evaluation recommendation to administratively consolidate P.L. 94-142 projects to alleviate start-up problems should be continued and refined. Further, in 1982-1983 steps should be taken to affect the same consolidation procedure for all P.L. 89-313 projects. Consistent with this consolidation model semi-annual reports on lag monies should be standard operating procedures in order to guarantee that shifts within these consolidated projects can be made in a manner which will most effectively utilize funds.
10. The largest projects (over \$ 130,000 Project Budget) must be required to provide on-going documentation (at a minimum through evaluation procedures) to articulate the accomplishments of these investments in an on-going way. If these projects are unable to successfully maintain such documentation and support for these investments, semi-annual to annual reorganization to guarantee that these investments are carefully monitored should occur. This is particularly true for the five largest P.L. 94-142 projects which include: The District Alternative

Education Center, PreVocational Program, McKinley School, Career Instruction Managers, Early Childhood Program, Over/Under Representation Remedial Plan, and Four Assistants to Students Support Services.

11. Delays and frustration in getting evaluation data for students and parents computerized were exacerbated by the lack of a Management Information Systems Users Committee for setting Student Support Service priorities for design, development and use of computer programming staff. Such a committee needs to be reestablished and meet on a regular basis to set priorities, review progress, and respond to problems in completion of MIS tasks. In addition, the Student Support Services Department could benefit from the appointment of a User's Manager. This person should be responsible for facilitating the accomplishment of tasks prioritized by the User's Committee. Further, the User's Manager's primary responsibility should be this activity and he/she should be available to make the "hard decisions" of how time and money allocations are to be determined and adhered to.
12. An evaluation User's Task Force should be continued in the upcoming academic year. This committee should have representatives (including clerical staff, project directors, service providers, project staff, a union member and consumers) as well as the Student Support Services Staff refine and improve the evaluation model based on direct experience with it.

13. Given that the ultimate value of this evaluation model is its availability and usefulness to the Student Support Services for evaluating the entire service delivery system, the plan to realize this goal needs to be more clearly developed. Piloting of such a plan with the Pupil Adjustment Counselors over the past spring (1982) was a beginning. This group it is intended will be incorporated into the system as of September 1982. But a comprehensive and thorough plan of how to proceed needs to be developed, and should be a top priority in order to guarantee that the value of this investment in evaluation and planning will be realized.

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON



STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

APPENDIX A M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Kenneth Caldwell
Student Support Services Manager

FROM: Betsy Weaver, Ed. D.
Student Support Services Evaluation Consultant

DATE: July 30, 1982

RE: Review and Planning Report of Special Education Federally
Funded Projects in Boston, 1982/Executive Policy Memorandum

Attached you will find the Executive Summary, Tables; and Conclusions and Recommendations for 1981-1982 along with the 1981 Executive Policy Memorandum. The Executive Summary reviews the major findings and conclusions from which recommendations and comments are derived. All the attachments listed above preview the Special Education Federally Funded Project Final Report. The Final Report (of approximately 200 pages) is currently in its final draft form. Following re-writing, editing, and typing, it will be made available to you and select staff (Project Directors, etc.) for review and comment. After this review, it will be available for your use and for general distribution.

As suggested in the Executive Policy Memorandum of 1981, the purpose of this memorandum is to provide "the bottom line" or overall assessment of where we stand with these projects and the evaluation process. Project-specific "bottom lines" accompany each project report.

In general, the projects and project investments did not change dramatically over the last year. Data regarding the participants, (who participated in which projects; what services they received) are consistent with the findings of last year. BPS trends are consistent also with state and federal priorities. What has changed, however, is the reliability of the totals for student participants. Unlike last year, we are no longer dealing with gross estimates. The number 2,518, for example, is an accurate, if conservative reflection of students served by these federally

funded projects for the period of time studied. It is conservative because any questionable student I.D.'s were deleted from the total calculation.

The Participant Service Reports (computerized reports on Forms 310, 320, and 330) offer "good, plain data." But because the SEIMS IEP computer program was not fully in place, the data is not comprehensive. Realistic expectations of what can be accomplished in programs required by Student Support Services needs to be established. My recommendation is that a User's Committee assist the Management Information Services Department in setting priorities for Student Support Services work. Therefore, while data from the Participant Service Report is good data, it does not demonstrate the full extent of its own usefulness for evaluation.

Verification of specific counts, then, is straight forward. Verification of the quality of services provided, on the other hand, continues to be an area in need of further effort. This effort is underway, and examples of it can be seen in the Pilot Verification and Quality of Education sections of the final report. This year, for example, mini-research questions were developed to evaluate the quality of education which these projects provided. The Quality of Education Questions from the Private ETL Retrieval Project, the Parent Assistance and Information Project, the Early Childhood Enrichment Project, Hearing-Impaired Evaluation and Service, and Language Assistance Projects were among this year's best. Unfortunately, other projects did not provide fully the promised data and analysis. Such projects include the Over/Under Representation Project, the CIM Project, the Special Needs Alternative Education Program, and the District Alternative Education Program.

Data that was submitted in a timely fashion did improve the quality aspect of the model. Additionally, ninety Student Support Service Project staff were trained. Procedures for verification of quality of service were established and formalized. Given this training and standardization of operating procedures, Project Directors and evaluation staff should be able to refine the quality of education indicators even further in the future. Next year, data will be expected from all projects on December 10, 1982 and on May 13, 1983.

In conclusion, there is no question regarding the appropriate use (under federal guidelines) of these SPED federal funds in the Boston Public Schools. Expenditures were made in a manner generally consistent with legally mandated priorities. Furthermore the data for 1981-1982 is considerably more verifiable than in previous years. Nonetheless, there remains a sizable amount of work to be done by the school system in order to understand project

outcomes and impacts. It will require the commitment and continued support of the Student Support Services Senior staff to ensure that all staff submit the data necessary for a thorough project evaluation.

Because of difficulties with the computer and staff turnover, the production of the final report has been delayed. (The final report should be ready for printing mid to end of August). Given this situation, you may be interested in sharing this memo and the other attached report sections with other BPS senior staff and with the State Department of Education. If you or they have further questions regarding this report, I would be delighted to furnish you with additional information.

cc: Mary Condon

BW/jmd

for

FORM SEIMS310 SEIMS PAGE 1 OF 1

10/02/81 FEDERAL PROJECT PARTICIPANT REPORT

Purpose: To report periodically, throughout the school year, the number and types of services, direct and indirect, the participant objectives, addressed by the services listed, by Project Goal and Number for all participants-students, parents, BPS employees and Non-BPS persons.

Copies: Original and 2 copies.

Routing: Form, SEIMS310, will be sent from a Project Coordinator, conducting or providing a Federal Project Service in the field, to the Project Director in the Central SPED Office. If the report on SEIMS310 is for an Individual participant, one page of SEIMS310 is sent for EACH participant. If the report is for a Group, either form SEIMS320 or 330 must be attached for listing the BPS EMPLOYEE, SEIMS320 or the BPS-Student, Parent of a Student or other Non-BPS Participants, Form SEIMS330. The Project Coordinator or the person providing the service or the person completing the form retains the second (2nd) copy of the form(s), sends the original and copy one (1st) to the Project Director. The Project Director checks the report for accuracy and completeness and retains copy one (1st) and sends the Original to the Data Entry Station where the Error Control Group performs an Error Analysis and submits the report to the Data Entry personnel at the terminal.

Items :

- 1- The date the report is due will be preprinted for three (3) submissions a year; however, as services are provided, the form should be completed and credit for early submission of the report will be captured in Item 11= below.
- 2- The Project Number is a number found in the SEIMS Code Index, Page C 40 in Section A. First, the Name of the Project should be written. Second, Page C 40 should be found and Section A scanned for the Project Name you write in the Name position. Next, correctly copy the four (4) digit Code Number found to the left of the Project Name in the Data entry spaces (. . .) found after the word -CODE- in Item 2=. Print ALL data entries using a No. 2 Pencil like; (~~7~~ 4 ~~2~~ 4), which stands for Parent Information/Assistance and Resource Project found on Page C 40, Section A.

SEIMS
FEDERAL PROJECT PARTICIPANT REPORT

- 1=DATE THIS REPORT IS DUE MM/DD/YY (. . / . . / . .)
- 2=PROJECT NUMBER -CODE- (. . . .) C 40 A NAME.....
- 3=DISTRICT NUMBER, C/P/1 THRU 9, LOCATION OF MEETING/SERVICE PROVIDED (.
'C-CENTRAL,P=PRIVATE'
- 4=PROJECT GOAL NUMBER -CODE- (. .) C 41 A NAME.....
- 5=TOTAL NUMBER OF SERVICE TYPES REPORTED, BOTH DIR. AND INDIR. (. .)
'COMPLETE THIS FORM FOR EACH SERVICE TYPE ENTERED ABOVE'
- 6=THIS REPORT IS FOR A GROUP/INDIVIDUAL G/I (.)
- 7=IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANT NAME-NUMBER-BIRTH DATE
LAST (.) ID NUMBER (.)
FIRST (.) BR.DATE MM/DD/YY (. . / . . / . .)
- 8=SERVICE TYPE AND DURATION OF SERVICE- DIRECT OR INDIRECT D/I (.)
THIS REPORT IS FOR ACTUAL TOTAL TIME PER PARTICIPANT
- | -CODE-C 42 A - B | NOTES | MINS/DAY | TIMES/WK | TOTAL WKS/PRTCPN |
|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------|
| (. .) | | (. . .) | (. . .) | (. . .) |
- 9=RELATED ACTIVITIES -CODE- C 43 A
- | | | | | |
|---------|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| (. .) | | (. . .) | (. . .) | (. . .) |
| (. .) | | (. . .) | (. . .) | (. . .) |
| (. .) | | (. . .) | (. . .) | (. . .) |
| (. .) | | (. . .) | (. . .) | (. . .) |
- 10=PARTICIPANTS OBJECTIVES, MONITORING AND RESULTS 'NOTES'
- | OBJECTIVES | HOW MONITORED | BASELINE | TARGET | ACTUAL |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| -CODE-C 44-5 A | -CODE-C 46 A | -CODE-C 46 B | | |
| (. .) | | B(. . .) | T(. . .) | A(. . .) |
| (. .) | | B(. . .) | T(. . .) | A(. . .) |
| (. .) | | B(. . .) | T(. . .) | A(. . .) |
| (. .) | | B(. . .) | T(. . .) | A(. . .) |
| (. .) | | B(. . .) | T(. . .) | A(. . .) |
- 11=DATE THIS REPORT SENT TO PROJECT OFFICIAL
MM/DD/YY (. . / . . / . .)
- 12=BPS PERSONNEL NUMBER OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS REPORT (.)
- 13=NON BPS NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS REPORT
LAST (.) FIRST (.)
- 14=SIGNATURE OF PROJECT PERSON COMPLETING THIS REPORT
- 105
- 15=ROLE OF PERSON COMPLETING REPORT-CODE-(. .) C 2 A NOTE.....
'ATTACH FORMS SEIMS320 OR SEIMS330 IF GROUP REPORT'

- 3= District Number is the number of the sub-district within BPS where the Services were provided or the Meeting was held. If the report is for a district-wide Goal or SPED Central, enter C for Central. If a Private School Service, enter P for Private
- 4= Project Goal Number is the coded number of a specific Project Goal which is found on Page C 41 of the SEIMS Code Index. In this case, write the name of the Goal in an abbreviated form. Look for your Project Name in Section A. When found, look for the Goal Statement, which matches the Goal Name you wrote; then copy the code number in the Data Entry spaces in Item 4=. The entry may look like; (. .).
- 5= The Total Number of Services you are going to report, at this time, needs to be entered, both Direct and Indirect services. There is a Special Instruction given after Item 5= which is in single quote marks. The special instruction states that for EACH of the Service Types one copy of SEIMS310 will be submitted. As an example, let's say you write (. .) in Item 5=, then you are saying that you will send three (3) reports of different Service Types as a total report of services provided for the Project Goal stated in Item 4=.
- 6= This item simply asks if you are reporting the services for a group (.) or an individual (.). Enter the appropriate letter.
- 7= Here is a shortcut. If you are making an individual service report, simply enter the three critical items for the Participant: Name, Last and First, BPS/or Student Id Number and Birth Date. (If participant is a parent, use student ID number.) Remember, all participants must be identified with an ID number. For students and family, student ID; for BPS staff, personnel number.
- 8= You are asked for four (4) different kinds of Information in this item. First, record if this service is Direct or Indirect by placing D or I in the entry space. Second, how many minutes per day on an average has each participant received this service. Third, how many times a week, on an average, did each participant receive this service. Finally, whether in consecutive weeks or over the total data collection period how many total weeks was the service provided per participant.

Let's try an example. Say you provide Inservice Training for BPS Employees two hours once a week, for three weeks, over the course of the data collection, you would enter in Item 8= the following:

D/I (I)

This report is for actual total time per participant

MINS/DAY	TIMES/WK	TOTAL WKS/PRTCPNT
----------	----------	-------------------

(120)

(04) 106

(03)

The above entries say that you are providing an Indirect service once a week, for two hours, for a total of three weeks. This does not necessarily have to be three consecutive weeks. However, the total time per participant is a total of three weeks.

Let's try another example. Say you are giving a direct service to a Student. The service consists of testing every Tuesday for 30 minutes for 12 weeks. You would enter in Item 8= the following:

D/I (D)

MINS/DAY	TIMES/WK	TOTAL WKS/PRTCPNT
(0.30)	(01)	(12)

Now that we have learned about Indirect and Direct, Service Duration, we need to enter the kind of Service by Note and Code. The Service Types are Direct (page C 42, Section A) and Indirect (page C 42, Section B). We write a Note and look up the code and correctly enter the letter code. Remember the above Duration of Service steps for the next item.

- 9= What related activities did you have to perform to provide the listed Service. Write a Note, look up the Code (page C 43, Section A, on the page) and enter it correctly. The next step is to report how much time you spent performing the related activities. Remember, time durations have to be reported as in Item 8=.

Let's take an easy example. Say you perform Record Keeping/Report Writing for a Training Course. You worked for 30 minutes before and 30 minutes after each weekly session, which happened 3 times. Your Item 9= duration entry would appear as:

MINS/DAY	TIMES/WK	TOTAL WKS/PRTCPNT
(.60)	(01)	(03)

You account for your total time given to the project in Item 9=; thus you may have more than one related activity. There is space for four (4). Use as many as needed to document your contributions to the project.

- 10= Now that you have stated the services you are providing, for how long, and if an individual or a group are receiving the services, it is time to list the Participant Objectives, how you have (or are) monitoring the objectives, the percentage of a problem as it exists (Baseline), the percentage of the problem you plan to solve (Target), and eventually the Actual percentage of the problem you solved. Item 10= requires some specific details.

First, the possible objectives are found on page C 44, Section A. These are the objectives that have been used in the past; however, if after you make a short (very short) note you can't find the participant objective you want, you may add an objective - you need only to contact your Project Director and submit a written objective. SPED Central will furnish the correct code. Hopefully this won't be necessary. Simply enter the code that matches what objective you are addressing and enter the correct letters from pages C 44 and C 45, Section A on each page.

Next, you need to enter who is monitoring the objectives and/or the documentation of the effects you are having on participants. The codes are on page C 46 Section A in the Code Index.

The headings for the Results of your service efforts are listed as Baseline, Target and Actual. Stated differently, these terms mean what is now (baseline), what do we want in the future (target) and what did really happen (actual). At this moment we can complete the Baseline and Target-later when the service is completed, we can enter the actual percentage of change. The CODES are found on page C 46 Section B.

Let's use an example to illustrate Baseline, Target and Actual. You have a project where the participants, students, are having reading problems and are 3 grades below the grade level of their peers. Your objective is to improve their reading skills. You are beginning with no or 0% accomplishment toward that objective. Hence, your BASELINE is 0%. You hope to improve the group by at least 50% This is your TARGET. Your

Baseline, B (. . .), entry would be (0 0 0) and the

Target, T (. . .), would be T (0 5 0). It is critical to remember you are entering percentages-not words. When the project is completed let's say you did better than your target. Then the entry for Actual,

A (. . .), may be A (0 8 0) or, on the average, reading scores improved 80%. These are gross measures for sure; but at this time, most objectives being written can be measured or estimated using percentages.

Let's try another example. Say you are trying to improve attendance by providing a brand new razzel-dazzel technique called Speaking Backwards. This new counseling service is sure to help students. The baseline question is- What is the current percent of attendance? (This could be found by using Average Daily Attendance, ADA, or Average Weekly Attendance, AWA, or any time unit in which the average is reflective of the student's current attendance.) Assume the average attendance is 85%, the entry for B

is (0.85) The goal of the counseling is to reach 95% attendance, thus T is (0.95). At the end of the project, you actually had an average of 90% or an A

of (0.90). You reached half of your objective criteria. (We'll still give you an A- for effort.) During your training many more examples will be used-be sure and ask questions about BASELINES, TARGETS, and ACTUALS.

- 11= Please enter the actual DATE you sent this report to your Project Official.
- 12= Enter your BPS Number from the Official Book of Numbers by I. Wallace and Daughter (no, no wrong author) from SPED Control.
- 13= If you're Non-BPS - Name Please in Data Entry Format - No. 2 Pencil, Printing neat Capitals.
- 14= Sign out, and
- 15= Tell us what you do by checking the Code Index, C 2 A and noting and entering the code stating your role.

GOOD LUCK!

INSTRUCTION

for

FORM SEIMS320

SEIMS

PAGE 1 OF 1

10/02/81 BPS EMPLOYEE FEDERAL PROJECT PARTICIPANT

Purpose: To document whom, by name and role, as BPS Employees received what Federal Project Services in a group setting.

Copies: Original and 2 copies.

Routing: When completed and attached (stapled) to Form SEIMS310, this form follows the same route as SEIMS310. Does that seem funny?

Items:

- 1= Enter the same Project Number as is on the SEIMS310 to which this form is attached. Double Check!
- 2= Enter the Date of this report. This Date is the Actual Date of the meeting or the projected Ending Date of the services being provided.
- 3= This section of Form SEIMS320 may be used as an Attendance sheet at a meeting or completed at the end of a service. There are three (3) non-computer entries per line and two (2) computer entries per line.

First the non-computer entries. The first set of parentheses () is for numbering the line or person. If you count the participants at a meeting and there are 10, you should have 10 lines completed and the last () should read (10). Next, under the word NAME, on the dots, the participant's name should be written. Under the word NOTE the BPS role of the participant should be written. If the participant knows (for sure) their BPS Number and Role Code, then let them enter it; if not, the person completing SEIMS310 should enter the correct number.

The computer entries must each be checked for accuracy. The BPS Number and the Role Code if known by the participant, may be entered if not, it is all yours.

- 4= Write your name and sign out. The special instruction at the bottom of the page says to number the lines sequentially from page to page when more than one page is needed. For example, if a second page is needed because you have 25 participants, the first line on the second page would be (?). Right!

SEIMS320
10/02//81

SEIMS
BPS EMPLOYEE FEDERAL PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

1=REPORT FOR PROJECT NUMBER -CODE- (. . . .) C 40 A

2=DATE OF THIS REPORT MM/DD/YY (. . / . . / . .)

3=BPS PARTICIPANT ATTENDANCE/PARTICIPATION REPORT

LINE#	BPS NUMBER	NAME	ROLE -CODE-	C 2 A	NOTE
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		
()	(.)		(. .)		

4=NAME AND SIGNATURE OF PROJECT PERSON ATTACHING THIS REPORT

N..... S.....
'USE AS MANY SHEETS OF THIS FORM AS NEEDED,NUMBER SEQUENTIALLY, AND
ATTACH THIS FORM TO SEIMS310 AND RETURN BOTH FORMS TO CENTRAL SPED
OFFICE'

INSTRUCTIONS

for

FORM SEIMS330

SEIMS

PAGE 1 OF 1

10/02/81

STUDENTS/PARENTS/OTHER NON-BPS FEDERAL

PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

Purpose: To document which Students, Parents or Non-BPS Participants received what services in a Group Setting from a given Federal Project.

Copies: Original and 2 Copies.

Routing: Same as SEIMS310 because this form is always attached to SEIMS310 (stapled) and seems to be dragged along.

Items:

- 1= This report is for what Project Number? Be sure to check the number you enter against the Project Number you entered on SEIMS310 for the numbers must be the same.
- 2= Enter the Date of this report. The Date is the Actual Date of the meeting or if more than one meeting is being reported then the projected Date of the final meeting. If you are reporting services report the projected Ending Date of the services.
- 3= This is an Attendance or a Participation report; thus, it will be helpful if the participants fill out as much of the form from this point on as possible (No, no... not the three year olds!). The non-computer entries are the first two lines, starting with the (), up to the column of asterisks (*). If the participant is a Student, then only the Line Number and the Role Note is completed on the first line up to the asterisks. The second line starting with STD (Student) is completed with the student's name and birth date. Continue down the page numbering every other line which starts with (). When the attendance or participation list is finished the reporter (Sorry, this probably means you) completes all of the computer entry data needed, the role codes and the student numbers. The data entry spaces are to the right of the column of asterisks(*)).
- 4= Name and Sign out (Name only if we can't read your X). One last reminder, Number the pages sequentially. If you had 15 participants the first line in Item 3= on the second page would be (?). Good, your right again!

SEIMS
STUDENTS/PARENTS/OTHER NON-BPS FEDERAL PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

1=REPORT FOR PROJECT NUMBER -CODE- (. . . .) C 40 A NAME.....

2=DATE OF THIS REPORT MM/DD/YY (. . / . . / . .) * -CODE-C 2 A

3=ATTENDANCE/PARTICIPATION REPORT * PARTICIP. ROLE

LINE#-PARTICIPANT NAME-ROLE-STUDENT NAME - BIRTH DATE * STUDENT NUMBER

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

() L.....F.....ROLE.....* (. .)

STD L.....F.....B.D..././...* (.)

4=NAME AND SIGNATURE OF PROJECT PERSON ATTACHING THIS REPORT

N..... S.....

1/29/82

Code Index
Page C42

C 42 A Direct Service

- (SC) = Screening
- (II) = Intake
- (ST) = Student Program Review
- (OR) = Original Evaluation (with assistance to meet project goal)
- (SE) = Special Re-Evaluation (to meet project goal)
- (SA) = Specialized Assessments (to meet project goals)
- (SR) = Specialized Reviews (to meet project goals)
- (OB) = Observation
- (GW) = Group Workshop
- (GC) = Group Counseling
- (IC) = Individual Counseling
- (CC) = Crisis Counseling
- (SS) = Support Service
- (TC) = Training Course
- (TE) = Teaching
- (SP) = Special Education Program
- (PR) = Special Education Program and Related Services
- (MI) = Working to Modify a Student's I E P
- (PO) = Services to Place a Student in an Occupational Program
- (OO) = Other
- (LL) = Services to retrieve students from private placements
- (WJ) = Work to set students up with employment (agencies or counselors) and/or jobs.
- () =

APPENDIX C2

1/29/82

Code Index
Page C42
Continued

C 42 B Indirect Services

- (ID) = Information Dissemination
- (WD) = Workshop
- (CO) = Course
- (PT) = Program Technical Assistance
- (ST) = Student Technical Assistance
- (SP) = Service Providers Consultancy
- (PR) = Project Administration Consultancy
- (OO) = Other
- (PC) = Parent Counseling
- (PA) = Parent Assistance (Support Problem Solving)
- (PP) = Private School Program Reviews
- (SS) = Support Services
- (SC) = Service Providers Counseling
- () =

1/29/82

Code Index
Page C43

C 43 A Related Activities

- (CD) = Curriculum Development
- (PL) = Planning
- (EG) = Evaluating Group
- (EP) = Evaluating Program
- (EN) = Evaluating Participant
- (PS) = Project Service Management
- (RK) = Record Keeping/Report Writing
- (DM) = Developing Materials
- (CM) = Case Management
- (CF) = Case Follow-up
- (MD) = Materials Dissemination
- (OR) = Ordering Materials
- (PR) = Program Research
- (PA) = Project Amendments and Hiring
- (ME) = Meetings Related to Providing a Project Direct or Indirect Service
- (TT) = Travel Time
- (SO) = Ordering and Obtaining Supplies and Equipment
- (HS) = Hiring Project Staff (announcing job, interviewing, etc.)
- (RP) = Recruiting Participants
- () =

11/09/81

Code Index
Page C44

C 44 A Student Participant Objectives

- (AS) = Increase Attendance in School
- (AP) = Increase Attendance in SPED Program
- (PR) = Increase SPED Program Participation
- (RS) = Decrease in necessary related services needed
- (CP) = Decrease in amount of time spent in current prototype
- (MP) = Decrease in restrictive/moved to less restrictive prototype
- (PP) = Movement from private to public placement
- (SC) = Successful completion of project related IEP
- (DC) = Training - Demonstrated competency in skill being taught
- (DA) = Improve demonstrated Academic Performance
- (CB) = Improve Classroom Behavior
- (VB) = Decrease Violent Behavior
- (SP) = Improve Socially Acceptable Behavior with Peers
- (SA) = Improve Socially Acceptable Behavior with Adults
- (CS) = Improve Communication Skills
- (MS) = Improve Motor Skills
- (VP) = To access a vocational program for student
- (SE) = To get student employment
- (ST) = To train student for a vocational trade
- (SS) = Increase students' trade skills
- (AI) = Accurately identify students for Sp. Needs Prgms.
- (SW) = Assist Student in Sheltered Workshop Placement
- (OO) =
- () =

1/29/82

Code Index
Page C45

C 45 A Parents/Teachers/Non-BPS Objectives

- (KL) = Increase knowledge of Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313
- (UB) = Increase understanding of SPED - BPS Procedures
- (US) = Improve understanding of Student's Program
- (NS) = Improve Problem Solving Skills, RE: Student's SPED Program
- (PS) = Improve Problem Solving Skills, RE: Student's SPED Program
- (NR) = Improving Negotiation Skills, RE: Student's Regular Ed. Program
- (CO) = Increasing Coping Skills between Parent and Student
- (PT) = Improve Parent's Skills in Teaching/Working with their child
- (PC) = Improve Parent Involvement in Child's Program
- (CM) = Increase Classroom Management Skills
- (TS) = Increasing Coping Skills between Teacher and Student
- (SU) = Improving Teaching Skills in Specific Subject Area
- (DS) = Improve Diagnostic Skills
- (DT) = Improve Dissemination Techniques
- (AR) = Improve Assessment/Review Procedures
- (SN) = Improving Staff Sensitivity to Student Needs
- (OO) = Other
- (CR) = Increasing Understanding of Community Resources
- () =

Parent Information/Assistance and
Resource Project
4424
June 10, 1982

Case Complaint No: _____

Hello my name is _____

I am calling from the Student Support Services Department (SPED) of the
Boston Public Schools. Our records show that in _____ you called
Date
the Parent Info/Assist Project _____ with a
Noreen/Anna/Toni
concern about _____ Special Education Program.
Student

Recently, you should have received a letter letting you know about
my calling. We are interested in following up with you about that call.
Would you mind if I asked you a few questions?

1. Can you remember the call, if yes, can you describe in your own
words what your concern was?

If no, (cue parent)

What action was taken by _____?
Noreen/Anna/Toni

Are you currently satisfied with the solution?

If yes, what do you think has made it work out. (Elements of Successful Complaint Resolution)

If no, what do you think have been the barriers for you to having the problems resolve? (Elements or barriers to Complaint Resolution).

Do you have Rx about how better parent's complaints would be handled?

How was the problem resolved?

Who was involved?

How long did it take?

Parents Training Project In Severe Special Needs
Project 3379
6/11/82

1. What types of Services have you received from the Parent Training in Severe Special Needs Project (PTP)?

2. Can you Rank these services provided by the PTP in order of those which have been all most important to you.

Support from Parent Trainer
Training in behavior Management
Access to community service
Information about services
Support from other parents
Consultation in the home
Transportation to and from school
Workshop on relevant topics
Dental services for students
Opportunities to discuss their children
Lending materials books and toys

3. Can you describe for me a particular incident when the Parent's Training Project did something which you feel was especially effective. (Description to include: when; where; who; what results).

Parents Training Project In Severe Special Needs
Project 3379
6/11/82

4. Specifically, can you describe an incident when Parent Training Project did not fulfill your expectations. an incident when it failed to do as you thought it should? (Critical Incidence-Problem-when; where; who; what results).

5. Description of unanticipated impacts of the Project.

Private ETLs
3383
Retrieval QQ
6/10/82

PROJECT _____

PARENT INTERVIEW NO: _____

Hello my name is _____

I am calling from the Special Education Evaluation Unit for the Boston Public Schools. Would you mind answering a few questions concerning your son/daughter's education program?

1. Our records indicate your son/daughter was previously in a private placement and is now being educated the Boston Public Schools. Is this correct?

If yes, proceed with Questions 2 through 4. If no, ask (1) Were there plans to bring him/her back? If yes, what happened?

(2) Name of Current Placement

(3) Who pays for Placement

2. Can you describe the process that took place moving your son/daughter from a private placement to their current Boston Public School Placement?

(a). What pleased or displeased you most about the process?

(b). How long did the process take?

3. Can you describe the services your son/daughter receives in their current Boston Public School Placement?

4. How do they compare with the Services your son/daughter received in their Private Placement?

Private ETLs
3383
Retrieval QQ
6/10/82

PROJECT: _____
E.T.L. INTERVIEW _____

1. Our Records indicate that _____ was on your
caseload for retrieval from private placement during 1980-1981
School Year and is currently placed in Boston Public Schools Program.

If yes, proceed with Questions 2 and 3. If no, stop and indicate,
You will check back over the information.

2. Can you describe the process bringing _____
back? (Was it smooth, what problems, etc)?
Name of Student

3. How does the program _____ received in the
Private Placement compare with the current Boston Public
Schools Placement? (Are the Services better, the same, etc)/
Name of Student